Cry Havoc!

The Great American Bring-down and How it Happened

Ralph de Toledano

Best-selling author of
Seeds of Treason, *RFK*, and
Lament for a Generation

About the Author

Ralph de Toledano, veteran newsman and a former Newsweek editor, has earned a reputation as one of the nation's best-informed writers and editors. As a leader and molder of the early conservative movement, he has been a friend of Presidents, political and military leaders, and members of the international Intelligence community. Author of 25 books, his writings on history, politics, and the arts have also appeared in Reader's Digest, National Review, the old Collier's and Saturday Review, American Mercury, Commentary, other national publications, and hundreds of newspapers. Born in the International Zone of Tangier of a New York World foreign correspondent, his journalistic assignments have taken him to key countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

One of the most incisive and best informed writers and political analysts: Ronald Reagan

Indisputably a splendid journalist: Editor & Publisher

Endowed with more than usual second sight: The Washington Post

Casts a piercing beam into the dark corners of our current history: John Dos Passos

Indefatigable in his search for facts: San Francisco Chronicle

His documentation is unusually precise and his writing top-notch: Dallas News

One of this nation's great reporters, he belongs with Richard Harding Davis: Peoria Journal

A fine writer and historian—fearless and accurate: Daniel Patrick Moynihan

Cry Havoc!

The Great American Bring-down and How it Happened

Ralph de Toledano

Anthem Books
Washington, D.C.

Copyright 2006 by Ralph de Toledano

Anthem Books—Suite 1010
500 Twenty-third Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

To

Jacques Barzun

teacher & friend

in lumine tuo videbimus lumen

Books by Ralph de Toledano

Cry Havoc!: The Great American Bring-down and
How it Happened
Notes from the Underground: The Chambers-Toledano Letters
The Apocrypha of Limbo: (verse)
Devil Take Him (novel)
Poems: You & I (verse)
Let Our Cities Burn
Hit & Run: The Ralph Nader Story
J. Edgar Hoover: The Man in his Time
Little Cesar: The Chavez Story
One-Man Alone: Richard Nixon
America I-Love-You
RFK: The Man Who Would Be President
The Conservative Papers (with Melvin Laird)
The Barry Goldwater Story
The Winning Side: Campaign '64
The Greatest Plot in History: Atomic Espionage Complete
Nixon
Day of Reckoning (novel)
Spies, Dupes & Diplomats
Seeds of Treason: (The Hiss-Chambers Tragedy)
Frontiers of Jazz (a critical anthology)

Contents

1.	America at Bay	1
2.	The Lights Go Out	10
3.	Comrade Lukacs & The Road to Frankfurt	21
4.	In the Beginning	29
5.	A Tree Grows in Weimar	41
6.	The Paradoxes of Weimar, Neo-Marxism, and Nazism	55
7.	Outreach to London, MI-6 & the *Sonnenkinder*	71
8.	The International Institute— Old Mission, New Target	82
9.	*Ipse Dixit*, or Don't Say We Were Not Warned	89
10.	The War on Family, Morality, Education	94
11.	Infiltration: New York, Hollywood, OSS	115
12.	The Institute Wars on Germany and America	126
13.	Lewin, Women's Lib & Correctness	137

14. The Road to Destruction 146

15. The Institute: Marcuse & "Critical Activism" 156

16. From Fromm to the Invasion of Communications 163

17. Fraud's Apotheosis: The Authoritarian Personality 177

18. The Tragic Past, Present & Future Part I 185

19. The Tragic Past, Present & Future Part II 197

Bibliography & Sources 215

Appendix I: Annotated Bibliography on the Frankfurt School 219

Appendix II: A Weather Underground Manifesto 227

Appendix III: George Orwell on Liberal/Left Intellectuals 230

Appendix IV: John Dewey and Permanent Revolution 232

Notes 236

Index 249

[1]

America at Bay

In the postwar years, American security and law enforcement faced problems which made the pursuit of a Dillinger, a Nazi agent, or a Soviet spy seem like a relaxed and uncomplicated pastime. Crime in the Thirties had been the property of criminals. Professionals manned the submachine guns and held up the banks. The areas of crime were clearly defined. But in the postwar era, crime became pandemic, striking the entire social structure, with recruits from all classes. It became in part a national sport, induced by a breakdown in the social restraints which, in a real sense, are the only effective inhibitors.

A traditionalist FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who had never forgotten the copybook maxim taught him by his mother, would tell a congressional committee that "one of the primary causes of the alarming increase in crime among our young people, for example has been the disintegration of the home as a guiding influence." In this he was only partially correct. The dramatic rise in crime during the first ten years after the war—27 percent over the 1933-39 statistics—which Hoover announced were bad enough. But for Hoover, contemplating juvenile crime, the picture was even grimmer. Living with reports from local police departments, he knew that young people under 18 accounted for almost 43 percent of the arrests for major crime, with about half of these under age 15. The burglary statistics alone showed that 53 percent of those arrested were under 18.

With no theory, knowledge, or explanation for what had struck the country, he took off agents from other duties to offer advice on such routine matters as the setting up of boy's clubs, the enlisting by law enforcement authorities of Parent-Teacher Associations or the Boy Scouts or church groups. But mostly he stressed the importance of parental interest, a theme which as permissiveness totally seized the nation, he and other disturbed Americans elaborated on it with increasing vehemence.

"Criminal behavior is learned behavior," he wrote for the *Syracuse Law Review.* "The child and the adolescent are impressionable, and their active minds develop codes of morality no higher than those to which they are exposed. The environment which the adult community provides its growing children is the most important factor underlying the behavior patterns cultivated by the normal child."

In the years that followed, the permissiveness which he had deplored assumed greater proportions. To what Hoover saw as moral laxity in the home was added external factors—unfettered sexual promiscuity among adults, teenagers, and pre-teens; the rising use of drugs, at all levels and all ages of the society; the takeover in films, TV, and the public arena of pornography and obscenity; the acceptance of "relativism" as a legal, philosophical, and moral doctrine, and its premise that "right" and "wrong" existed only subjectively and the debasement of education, the family, and religion.

By 1959, Hoover would tell the House Appropriations Committee: "Basically the increase in crime activity reflects a moral disintegration that has corrupted millions of American citizens who obey the law themselves yet passively tolerate immorality. They have been afflicted by a sickness which I call the 'decadence' of lethargy, self-indulgence, and the principle of pleasure before duty." And again he, and those who worried with him, were partially right. In the Sixties, when the latest crime figures showed a one-year increase in crime of 17 percent, Hoover testified that "morality, integrity, law and order, and other cherished principles of this country's great heritage are fighting for their very survival. The victims of crime must be asking when they hear all that clamor for the unlimited rights of criminals, whether they have any civil rights as well."

For these views, J. Edgar Hoover and those who agreed with

him were stridently attacked. Had they spoken in the beeble-babble of the "new" psychology, they might have had a small hearing, but who could take seriously people who actually believed in motherhood. Because he limited himself to the crime statistics he received from police departments, he ascribed this corruption to the weakening of the American fiber—caused by the millions returning from war and the blunting of the psyche by combat and death. But how explain why a generation which had known World War II only in their diapers days, rioted, organized terror groups, burned the flag, trashed college buildings, and intimidated entire campuses and their administrators, and inaugurated a deadly drug culture—all the while cursing their country, its institutions, its culture, its religious bent, and its spirit.

The tragic fact is that those who saw what was happening to the nation's social structure and psyche had not the faintest idea of the cause of the deconstructionism afflicting the country. The FBI was neither equipped nor authorized to delve into such matters—and academia and the media were either involved or elsewhere detained.

Henry Adams posited a historical "law of acceleration" in his *Education*, and it is manifest in the speed in which the initial disease of the 1950s had by the turn of the new century become epidemic. The vaunted flow of ideas and concepts in higher education were replaced by political correctness and the ideological rape of the past. The freedoms which made the press a significant factor in the democratic process were in most cases jettisoned for one-note regimentation and repression. Politics were practiced in Kilkenny Alley. Marijuana addiction gave way to heroin and cocaine, corrupting police forces and city governments as Prohibition had done; one-parent homes became the norm, and teenage pregnancy flourished; pornography, now a billion-dollar "industry," left the shadows; and marriage became little more than slam-bang-thank-you-ma'am.

To this must be added "women's liberation" which castrated the male of the species; discombobulated normal male-female relationships; deprived generations of young people of the stability of a home with two parents, encouraging male homosexuality; and convincing young women that it is better to seek fulfillment in a dildo than in marriage or in heterosexual ties.

In the darkest hour of the War of Independence, when every battle seemed lost, George Washington ordered: "Let only Americans stand guard." For this, in these sorry days of the 21st Century, he would have been deprived of his command and ordered to take sensitivity training. But now on this continent, do Americans still hold sway? The principles and dreams of 1776 and 1789, annealed in the 1860s, are a tuppence product, even at a time of war, along with the Madisons and Jeffersons who launched a new kind of nation defined by what were then unshakable principles.

Now, less than five decades after the feeble warnings of a few leaders, the nation's daily rhetoric steams up from a *cloaca.* The institutions of civilization and order are under withering attack. Perversity is increasingly a way of life. What was once obscenity is the ordinary currency. The present obscenity is God, morality, the family. Rape and murder fill the newspapers. Children kill their parents, their teachers, their friends—and 13-year-olds demand abortion. Young people leave college less prepared for life than the 18-year-olds of a half-century ago. The Bill of Rights is a scrap of paper, attached to a decaying and ignored Constitution. Education is a medium for dissolution, abolishing learning. The media is steeped in prevarication and nihilism.

This is not true of all Americans or of all classes. But it is the coinage minted and scattered by the intellectuals, the educators, the opinion makers, and mass communication—the makers and shakers of American society and what was once the American spirit. It cries out for an answer:

Why the decline and fall of American civilization and its basic Judeo-Christian culture? Does it stem from a corruption brought on by too much material wealth and success? Is the steady destruction of religion, morality, education, legal principle, and human self-respect simply the result of a national Altzheimer's epidemic? Or is America the victim of a planned destruction by the men and 'isms' which over three centuries have keel-hauled Europe?

Consider education, the seed-bed of any society. Until the mid-1950s, American education, in its scientific and humanistic phases, was among the foremost in the Western world. It now lags behind that of the so-called developing world. The United States spends more on education than any other country, with elementa-

ry and high school costs rising geometrically to more than $19,000 per student, college and graduate tuition pushing well beyond $40,000, at the last reading so that a student must either be rich or enter work or profession in heavy debt.

Authoritative studies rank U.S. high school students as the 24th among 29 countries. American 15-year-olds who will enter a technological society have less proficiency in mathematics and science than their peers in Hungary or Slovakia, and in a tragic number of cases they are behind students in third-world countries.

Fifty percent of all college freshmen must take remedial courses in mathematics and reading. To get students into college, high schools practice "grade inflation," where what was once a C becomes an A, propelling failing students to greater failure.

"Dumbed down" standards in secondary schools continue the slide in college, given what one anguished educator has called a "Mickey Mouse" curriculum: Mindless courses like "Canine Cultural Studies" (University of North Carolina), "I Like Ike But I Love Lucy" (Harvard), "History of Electronic Dance Music" (UCLA), "Rock & Roll" (University of Massachusetts), and "Hip-Hop, Beats, Rhythm, and Culture" (George Mason University). In the 1930s, Columbia gave a one-credit course with no final exam in "The History and Literature of the Pianoforte"—but that course was designed, it was said, for football players.

The failure of college education is compounded by high school teachers who are unable to pass exams in the subject they are teaching, and have trouble with arithmetic and reading, but cannot be removed, receiving automatic raises because they are protected by powerful teachers unions.

New York City's public school system, in the past one of the nation's finest, has become a disaster area, and City College, once requiring a 90 percent average for admission, has taken a header by an "open admissions" policy which honors now-meaningless high school diplomas.

Yet any effort to institute a system of testing for teacher competence, or to tie wage increases to excellence in teaching, has been blocked by the National Education Association (NEA) the only Federally-chartered trade union (analogous to the American Red Cross), and its stranglehold on the Department of Education—with the vociferous support of the liberal establishment. By

NEA tenet, inexperienced or harried teachers now "quiet" their pupils by introducing them to the drug culture of Ritalin and Prozac, drugs which frequently induce violent behavior—and this without parental permission.

All of this, necessary for the breakdown and corruption of education is abetted by a Congress which holds that education's problems can be solved by larger and larger infusions of tax dollars, though the more spent is in inverse ratio to the results—and members of Congress in the thrall of an NEA which invests heavily in the Democratic Party, and the neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian "educationist" cabal, which controls faculties and administrators, as well as the graduate schools of education.

George Will, a lonely conservative in the *Newsweek-Washington Post* orbit, once sadly noted that "many campuses are intellectual versions of one-party nations." Leftist Democratic professors, other surveys show, outnumber Republicans by 30:1 in the various disciplines, particularly in literature, philosophy, the humanities, and history. College and university administrators are so overwhelmingly neo-Marxist, neo-Freudian, and "blame-America-firsters" that many professors who do not share their ideology audiotape their lectures so that they can refute charges that they are "racist," "sexist," "neo-fascist," and worst of all, "conservative." Professors who advocate the liquidation of the white race go unmolested, while those who speak respectfully of American values find themselves in trouble.

Where academia was once an arena for differing views of history, economics, the arts, the humanities, and a full range of the curricula, true diversity has been torpedoed by a "political correctness" which ordains toleration of the left and brutal intolerance of the right. The order of the day is the ceaseless demeaning of America's history, traditions, principles, historic figures and their and achievements—and proclamations that America from its inception was foul.

A recent survey of seniors at 55 leading colleges shows that 98 percent could identify the rap "artist" Snoop Doggy Dogg, but only 34 percent knew that George Washington was commander-in-chief during the War of Independence. A Department of Education study discloses that 50 percent of white college students and 80 percent of blacks could not use a bus schedule; 90 percent

could not use a calculator; 57 percent could not reckon the change they should receive from $3.00 on a $2.55 check or calculate the tip; 42 percent could not put the American Civil War in the right century; and 35 percent did not know the difference between the European Reformation and our post-Civil War Reconstruction. Of those who had heard of the Reconstruction era, half placed it after World War II.

The family is the cement that holds society together. The family moves in tangent with the moral sanctions of religion; with the relationship of parents to children; with the complementary functions of male and female: with a restraint of the explosive power of the sex drive; with the basic stability that stems from family ties. These now are considered dangerous. Marriage is now becoming a disappearing institution, children and the nuclear family obsolete. Though children brought up by their biological parents are psychologically healthier and socially more integrated, women who choose to be home-makers are held in contempt. Children are considered the property of the state and in many cases are taken from their homes without notice to parents.

Teen-age sex has encouraged diseases such as AIDs. And though even minor surgery without parental knowledge and consent is barred by legal and medical practice, teen-age abortion is sanctioned without even notification to mother or father. A drive to legalize same-sex marriage, which destroy the nuclear family and contributes to the dangerously falling birth-rate is convulsing the courts and the state legislatures.

Women's liberation has become a scourge. Pre-pubescent sex is encouraged in schools as a means of undermining parental authority. No-fault divorce contributes mightily to the break-up of families, and the glorification of homosexuality is the norm. The systematic debasement of men, subject to legal retribution and other forms of obloquy are imbedded in the culture. Our moral arbiters have convinced the courts and the justice system that criminal behavior is the fault of society and not the individual. The sole aim of life, the youth is taught, is the orgasm and the chase for "self-esteem." "Political" and "junk" science dominates research and invades the legislative arena.

Secularist fanatics, led by the American Civil Liberties Union and loose-constructionist courts have torn up the First Amend-

ment of the Constitution—so that any manifestation of a faith in God, even as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, is taboo, and mention of God in a public place is legally actionable. The Founding Fathers, in their law and practice, knew that religious faith and the belief in the sanctity of man were the twin pillars of democracy and a just society. But now it is politically and legally incorrect to so recognize that Deity to which 95 percent of American make obeisance, and the order of the day demands the legal evisceration of religious freedom.

The National Education Association, with its budget of $300 million or ten times that of the AFL-CIO, officially boasts that it is tapping the "legal, political, and economic powers of the U.S. Congress, with sufficient clout to reorder the priorities of the United States of America." Its environmentalist allies gloat that the American population will shrink from 300 million to about 22.5 million because of famine and "global warning"—and mightily labor to shut down the American economy, while successfully preventing the tapping of tremendous new sources of energy. Simultaneously they have brought death by malaria to 45 million in India alone, and argue that only by wiping out the human race will environmental heaven descend to earth.

Conspiracy theories are not respectable or politically correct among conspirators. But the record is there—signed, sealed, and delivered, and going back to the fourth decade of the Eighteenth Century in Karl Marx's apocalyptic message. Years before he had inflicted the unscientific maunderings of *Das Kapital* and the dogmas of dialectical materialism on a long-suffering world, Marx called for what had to be accomplished—the "ruthless destruction of everything existing." That destruction would wipe out religion, the family, morality, the free interplay of men and economic forces, human relationships, and everything that made Western civilization. What he spawned was a rationale and a formula for the violent eradication of the Judeo-Christian flowering, and centuries of hope and struggle. By this erasure an impotent and deracinated Western would collapse of its own perverse weight. Less than a century later, Lenin would preach the power of the strategic minority, small in numbers but able to overcome a disoriented majority.

So in 1922, the conspiracy was hatched at the Marx-Engels

Institute in Moscow by Karl Radek, a power in the Politburo and the representative of Lenin; Felix Djerzhinski, head of the Soviet secret police, Georg Lukacs, cultural commissar of the short-lived Hungarian Bolshevik revolution; and Willi Muenzenberg, the Comintern's organizational genius. The seemingly modest instrument was the Institute of Social Research, planted in the prestigious Frankfurt University and dedicated to neo-Marxism—contributing to the corrupt miasma of Weimar Germany and the victory of Adolf Hitler's National Socialists. In its years of domination of Weimar cultural life, it reached out to British academic and intellectual circles and their effectives in the intelligence service's MI-6. Driven out of Germany, it was brought to Columbia University in 1938 by John Dewey and a crypto-communist professorial cabal—and a conspiracy and a war so vast and so cunning that it went unnoticed began. "We will take over the intellectuals," Willi Muenzenburg boasted. "We will make American stink."

This then is the first full account of that conspiracy—weaving through the history of World War I and Versailles, Lenin's struggle for the survival of Bolshevism, the secret German-Soviet economic and military alliance of 1917-1940, the joint onslaught of Communist and Nazi, the Cold War, and the subversion of America's institutions, and with them America's will to survive.

What is past is prelude, and it is in the context of this great *Kulturkampf* that the record must be searched and laid bare, however shocking.

★ ★ ★

[2]

The Lights Go Out

In 1843, before he had confused philosophy and political theory with dialectical materialism and convoluted "economic laws," the young Karl Marx, already afflicted by a conviction of personal godhead and the carbuncles which years later embittered him as he suffered the wooden seats of the British Museum, wrote, "The proclamation of ready-made solutions for all time is not our affair, when we realize all the more clearly what we have to accomplish in the present—I am speaking of a *ruthless criticism of everything existing*, ruthless in two senses. The criticism must not be afraid of its own conclusions, nor of conflict with the powers that be." (Emphasis in the original.)

> The socialist principle itself represents, on the whole, only one side, affecting the *reality* of the true human essence. We have to concern ourselves just as much with the theoretical existence of man, or in other words to make religion, science, etc., the objects of our criticism . . . Our motto must therefore be: Reform of consciousness, not through dogmas, but through analyzing the consciousness which is unclear to itself, whether it appears in religious or political form... The work of our time [is] to itself (critical philosophy) the meaning of its own struggle and its own desire.

In that same year, Karl Marx would write: "*The immediate task of philosophy*, which is in the service of history, is to unmask human

self-alienation in its *secular* form now that it has been unmasked in its *sacred form*. Thus the *criticism of heaven* is transformed into a *criticism of earth*, the *criticism of religion* into the *criticism of law*, and the *criticism of theology* into the *criticism of politics*"—for the denigration of Western civilization and culture. (Emphasis his.)

Marx's words were put aside after *The Communist Manifesto*, published five years later, warned rhetorically that "a specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism." The publication of *Das Kapital* and the endless political and economic militant advocacy he engaged in with Friedrich Engels further obscured what his original message had been. From that time on, Marxism focused on his economic and directly political threats. His attack on Western culture became secondary to the reworking of the Hegelian dialectic and an "analysis" of capitalism which history proved to be a hundred percent off the mark. It was not until some eight decades later that the preachments of the early Marx were resurrected as neo-Marxism, and miscegenetically wedded to neo-Freudianism.

Some of Marx's early rhetoric did filter through to Tsarist Russia, but only those aspects, later to become the basis for a youth movement, which saw as the way to a revolutionary *nirvana* a dedication to spit on God, defy Western civilization, and never wash one's neck. The eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1910-1911), describes what Ivan Turgeniev,a contemporary Russian novelist, noted as the characteristics of what would emerge as the "new" brand of revolution, and eventually reach America.

"Among the students of the universities and the higher technical schools, Turgeniev had noticed a new and strikingly original type—young men and women in slovenly attire, who called in question and ridiculed the generally received convictions and respectable conventionalities of social life, and who talked of reorganizing existence. They reversed the traditional order of things even in trivial matters of external appearance, the males allowing their hair to grow long and the female adepts cutting it short, and adding sometimes-additional badges of blue spectacles. Their appearances, manners, and conversation were apt to shock ordinary people, but to this they were profoundly indifferent." Turgeniev called them "nihilists," a term which applies with equal felicity to today's neo-Marxists.

Nihilists

"Among the antiquated institutions which [according to the nihilists] had to be abolished were religion, family, and private property and centralized administration. Religion was to be replaced by 'science,' family life by free love, and private property by collectivism, and individualism by dictatorship. Some of the nihilists set themselves up in the villages as school teachers and attempted to stir up disaffection among the peasantry. They preached that the economic situation was 'desperate' and that it was necessary to destroy the national culture and by bloody means to overthrow the government. From this developed the Society for the Liberation of the People—the Weather Underground of our times comes to mind—led by Nechaev, who later inspired Lenin. Nechaev preached unfocussed violence and nihilist terror, including the assassination of the Tsar and other officials, and inspired a police counter-terror.

These nihilists were a part of the revolutionary amalgam, and fitted in with what would dominate the Communist International until Stalin turned it over to the secret police. The Nechaev-Bakunin *Catechism of a Revolutionist*, which Lenin embraced, spelled it out: "One should conspire with the liberals in accordance with their programs, pretending that one follows them blindly, and at the same time one should dominate them . . . compromise them to the utmost . . . and then use them as instruments for stirring up disturbances in the state."

The evils of society were to be encouraged to bring people to the sticking point. Destructionism and the organization of catastrophe were the goals—and to that end revolutionists were to work. The other side of *nechaevschina*—that the revolutionist was a "doomed man," with "no sentiments, attachments, property, not even a name...[with] everything in him absorbed by...one passion, the revolution"—would be the lure for theatrical revolutionists like André Malraux and Benito Mussolini.

After World War I

Marx's call for the criticism of "everything," however, would lie fallow, until history took a turn that neither he nor the West had contemplated—World War I and its aftermath, which demonstrated that the "world revolution," though followed by the overthrow by the Bolsheviks of the Kerensky government in Rus-

sia—the most democratic in the world," Lenin would characterize it—was not to be.

Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin was as ruthless and cold-blooded as his successor, but he was not as ideologically ossified as Joseph Stalin. When famine, as a result of the Soviet revolution, brought the Communist regime to the edge of collapse, Lenin established the New Economic Policy, and accepted the aid of the hated United States, to prevent mass starvation and total economic collapse. And it was Lenin who approved the plans of Willi Muenzenberg, the man he set up to head the Communist International's organization, propaganda, and infiltration machine, to finance the creation in Germany of an organization which would succeed beyond his wildest dreams—the Institute for Social Research—in the context of Marx's earlier deconstructionism, putting aside concepts of immediate world revolution. It was Lenin's canniest move.

Muenzenberg, as head of the Comintern *apparat*, had not based his plans on any loss of Bolshevik faith but on a shrewd and hard-headed assessment of the European situation in the early 1920s. Both Lenin and Muenzenberg realized that the revolution had come first to semi-feudal Russia, rather than to an advanced capitalist state in Germany as Marx had posited. They realized as well that the proletariat—the vaunted working class—would never be a vehicle for the overthrow of the industrial West. That overthrow would come only after the West had been internally destroyed by what Julien Benda, the brilliant French polemicist, would later call "*la trahison des clercs*"—the treason of the intellectuals. Muenzenberg put it more practically. "We must organize the intellectuals, and use them to make Western civilization stink," he said to Party leaders and activists like Ruth Fischer, Number One member and organizer of the Austrian Communist party and later an ideological power in Germany. "Only then, after they have corrupted all its values and made life base, can we impose the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"The crises of history have much longer roots than is commonly believed," Whittaker Chambers wrote to this writer in the mid 1950s. The crisis that in the 1920s faced the Soviets and the world Communist movement had roots going back to the Great War. In 1917, Germany and the Central Powers were caught in a military stalemate in which thousands of casualties were the price

for advances and retreats of yards. That stalemate was threatened by the entry of fresh troops and fresh cannon-fodder—the American Expeditionary Forces under General "Black Jack" Pershing. The sole possibility for fending off defeat lay in ending the conflict on the Eastern Front, where the Russians were floundering in their own blood—and the bodies of the frozen dead were piled like cordwood. The Imperial Russian armies were on the verge of collapse, and it was to Germany's advantage to encourage this and dominate any new government.

The powers on both sides of the conflict had believed that the lights would sputter on again, in a year at the most. But on the Western front, bloody attrition was the order of the day. On the Eastern front, the German army discovered that no matter how many Russians they slaughtered, the war continued. Though the Tsar was overthrown, Prince Lvov, whose provisional government briefly held sway, and Alexander Kerensky who succeeded him, ignoring mutinies in the field and deep mutterings at home, still pledged to continue the fighting. In Petrograd and Ekaterinburg, in Moscow and Nizhni Novgorod there was disorganized popular opposition. Only the Bolsheviks propagandized for an end to Russian participation.

The Imperial German General Staff and the shrewder minds of the Reichsbank saw their opportunity. Lenin, exiled in Switzerland was offered transportation from the Swiss border, through Germany, to Petrograd on a "sealed" train. The alleged "seal," of course, was to protect Lenin from charges that his efforts to overthrow the Kerensky government had the backing of Russia's enemies. Secret German correspondence discloses that the train, carrying Lenin and other exiled Bolshevik leaders, stopped for forty hours in Berlin during which time, the seal now porous, Lenin, the Reichsbank, and the Imperial German General Staff made the deals which established a lasting partnership.

Communications from the Imperial General Staff to the Bolsheviks, "abstracted" from Moscow files, were released by George Creel, director of President Wilson's Committee on Public Information, authenticated by a group of historians and Russian scholars to whom they were submitted—and in the 1950s, Creel told this writer that signatures, typing, paper, etc. of these documents were identical to other genuine contemporaneous Russo-German documents,

* The "Sisson Documents"?

and that the documents now safely buried in the national archives, were incontrovertibly genuine evidence of the symbiotic relationship that developed between Germany and the Bolsheviks.

The German General Staff and the Reichsbank had a double motivation in linking arms with Lenin and the Bolsheviks. With Russia out of the war, the German military could shift much needed military manpower from the East to the Western Front where, it was still believed in Berlin, one more mighty push would break the back of the Anglo-French forces, before American power could swing the balance. The Reichsbank had long-range plans to employ Russian industrial potential to bolster its own depleted resources. Were the war to end in stalemate, the combination of Germany's industrial genius and Russia's vast national resources would match or exceed the burgeoning industrial muscle of the United States.

The Creel documents spell it out:

Item. A 1917 document on the letterhead of the German General Staff's Intelligence (*Nachtrichten*) section in Berlin, addressed to the "Government of the People's Commisars," stated that, in accordance with the agreements between our General Staff and the leaders of the revolutionary army . . . Lenin [and] Trotsky," German forces would participate in and direct revolutionary activities within Russia"—and a list of German officers being assigned was appended.

Item. On 12 January 1918, the General Staff gave Commissar of Foreign Affairs Leon Trotsky a list of the "main candidates for reelection" to the Communist Party's Central Committee. "The General Staff orders us to insist on the election of the following persons: Trotsky, Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev [etc.]. Please inform the President of the Council [Lenin] of the General Staff's wishes."

Item. Shortly thereafter, a memorandum from the Reichsbank to Trotsky noted: "Notification has been received . . . from Stockholm that 50 million rubles in gold has been transferred to the People's Commissars. This credit has been supplied in order to cover the cost of the Red Guards [at the time Lenin's most reliable troops] and agitators in the country . . . I am instructed to convey the agreement of the Imperial Bank against the credit of [an additional] 5 million gold rubles [for the capture of U.S. war materials being sent to the Imperial Russian forces]."

Item. Subsequently, a representative of the Reichsbank wrote to Lenin: "You can destroy Russian capitalists if you please, but it is not possible for us to permit the destruction of Russian [industrial] enterprises." The "guiding" principles of what Lenin had agreed to on the "sealed" train were reiterated. It was "essential to gather statistical information with regard to the condition of industry, and in view of the absence of money in Russia to address in business conversation" a consortium of German banks.

Item. In the putative postwar era, moreover, there would be a German monopoly of Russian foreign trade, and all goods shipped to Russia would have to be paid in advance "to the amount of 75 percent" with the balance payable in six months. It was also noted that the agreements signed by Lenin gave Germany many exclusive rights for five years after the peace for Russia's "coal, metallurgical, machine tools, oil, chemical, and pharmaceutical" industries—with Russia's industrial economy run by a "supreme advisory organ" dominated by Germany.

Lenin was a better analyst of historical events than the international bankers who, war or no war, still maintained ties and communications which ignored the battle lines. He was ready to promise the Germans anything, if it would prevent the collapse of the new Bolshevik state, but he had no intention of keeping those promises. As he saw it, the likelihood was that given a few more years of the bloodletting on the Western front, the Germans would turn to him for help, as indeed they did. The Treaty of Rapallo, signed by Imperial Germany and the "new Russia"—the first diplomatic document recognizing the Bolshevik regime—was proof enough.

The collapse of the Imperial Reich, and the Armistice negotiated on a railroad siding in Compiegne by harsh and implacable representatives of Britain and France, embodied in the Twenty-One Conditions imposed by the Allies, confirmed Lenin's analysis. The "peace" that followed, under the terms of the calamitous Versailles Treaty, guaranteed the destruction of the balancing forces in Europe which had obtained through the 1800s and the promise of new global hostilities in the next several decades. The *revanchisme* of Clemenceau in France, Orlando in Italy, and Lloyd George in Great Britain was aided and abetted by the puerile "idealism" of Woodrow Wilson, applauded by such future

supporters of Marxist cultural aggression as were represented in the assault on the West and embodied in what would later be called the Frankfurt School. At Versailles, Clemenceau for France, Lloyd George for Great Britain, and Orlando for Italy were, after all, merely enunciating the belief that to the victor belongs the spoils. President Wilson, wrapped in beneficence and floundering in geopolitical innocence, exacted a far higher price on European survival—"self-determination." As a slogan, it was no more pernicious than those mouthed by other reformers. In practice it embodied the destruction of the stabilizing Austro-Hungarian empire—the life-support for a viable and manageable Europe—and the fragmentation of the continent into what, if carried to its logical conclusion would have divided into little more than city-states the territory from the Rhine to the Russian border.

Wilson's passion for self-determination Balkanized Central and Eastern Europe, creating new and unhomogenized states, each bearing the seeds of ethnic conflict. Yugoslavia was patched together from remnants of the Austria-Hungarian Empire—Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, with Moslem and Christian thrown higgledy-piggledy into the pot. Czechs and Slovaks were self-determined into Czechoslovakia, with a Sudeten German population which would later give Hitler an issue and an entering wedge. Poland was reconstituted, with a lump of Germany in its bosom. Austria and Hungary were denuded, leaving them vulnerable to totalitarian pressures. Colonial entities in Africa and Asia were left intact, though they had been carved out with no thought to tribal or ethnic sensibilities. A *faux* nationalism was unleashed which after World War II saw the continents broken up into tiny ethnic states, unable to compete politically against the established victors, untouched by "self-determination." The lights barely flickered, and in those instants of illumination they had revealed a Europe staggering under its problems and burdened by tremendous war debts, and a Germany, once its most powerful entity, impoverished, bitter, corrupt, and almost *in extremis*, in which the Left and the Right battled for power. Military revolts jostled labor uprisings and attempted coups. Adolf Hitler's nascent National Socialist movement, with support from the wartime officers' corps under General Ludendorff, battled for the support of demobilized soldiers. Communists and Socialists

battled each other. The one stabilizing force was the Reichswehr, or what remained of it.

Lenin's great and obsessive fear was that Germany would drift into an alliance with the Western powers and become the staging area for a capitalist war against the Soviets. Attempts at the Bolshevization of Germany failed miserable, causing Lenin to set aside concepts of "world revolution." He became convinced that only with a neutralized Germany could his Bolshevik regime survive in Russia. He implemented this conviction with two contradictory efforts—cooperation and subversion.

The developing situation in Germany was consistent with what Lenin and the Bolsheviks sought. The Versailles Treaty had left the country in the hands of a vacillating Social Democratic government—the Weimar Republic—unable to cope with a devastating inflation and the rampaging of left, right, and center. Adolf Hitler and National Socialism threatened. Undisciplined radicals on the left were futilely attempting coups and bloody subversion. Ill-timed revolts, mounted by Marxists were almost the order of the day.

The presumably hog-tied Reichswehr—reduced to 100,000 troops and 4,000 officers and organized by General Hans von Seekt—provided stabilization. Carefully buried in U.S. archives are the post-Versailles agreements between the Reichswehr and the Bolsheviks. These secret agreements, discovered by the U.S. after the fall of Berlin in 1945 and buried by the State Department, provided for the training of German troops in Russia, with reciprocal training of Soviet generals in Germany. Bi-national corporations were set up to provide for the rearming of Germany, with a cautious economic integration in limited areas. The Seekt-Lenin agreements were later formalized and their broad provisions integrated in the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939.

Through Karl Radek, a trusted lieutenant, Lenin had attempted a "National Bolshevik" *putsch* in Germany—the last flutter of "world revolution". Working with him was Willi Muenzenberg, the organizational and propaganda genius who for years made the Comintern a force in world subversion and infiltration. According to Marxist analysis, Germany was ripe for revolution. Berlin had become the world capital of moral corruption with sexual perversion and excess its keynote. German culture, its intellectual

life, had become equally dissolute. But though Radek and Muenzenberg had been aided by paramilitary units of the German Communist Party, the attempted coups in various German states had failed, and *Der Tag* never materialized. Karl Radek returned to Moscow with Muenzenberg, leaving the field clear for Seekt and the Reichswehr to prop up the feeble Social Democratic regime which clung to office until Hitler and Stalin toppled it in 1932.

Lenin's policy of exporting revolution to save revolution at home failed not only in Germany. The moldering pieces of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire seemed to promise success Only in Hungary, however, were Bela Kun and a congeries of Soviet agents able to establish a government. But the Hungarian revolution disclosed one of the paradoxes of contemporary history—that communism appeals least to people steeped in political and economic misery. In the case of the Communist Bela Kun regime, it became rapidly clear that the Hungarian people, who had been "liberated" from the bureaucracy imposed by Vienna, were not going to trade their independence for Bolshevism's bloody mercies. Bela Kun's viciously oppressive Bolshevik regime collapsed, its only achievement being the supplying of trained and ruthless terrorists to the Communist International, some of whom would find work in Muenzenberg's underground German operations And in Italy where Marxist parties and trade unions seemed about to seize control, they were being routed by an ex-socialist named Benito Mussolini.

It is an irony of history that Lenin's strategy, despite its eventual failure, led to a secret new plan of operations, based on Karl Marx's 1843 doctrines, becoming the basis for the incredible success of a different assault on the West, and planting the seeds for the cultural, social, and moral decline of Western civilization, particularly in the United States, through the seemingly unlikely instrumentality of what came to be known as the Frankfurt School. The Soviet Union did not reach its nadir until the 1980s, but the anti-Western strategy devised by Lenin and Muenzenburg in the early 1920s, began coming to fruition in the 1960s, and continued even after the collapse of the Soviet system.

Though the efforts of Tsar Nicholas to move Russia into the modern world had brought it the greatest prosperity in its history, war and communism's economic policies had brought famine and

chaos to the country. Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP), which opened the doors a few inches to capitalism, allowed the Soviet economy to stagger on. The defeats taught Muenzenberg and the Communist International a lesson of transcendental importance: The bourgeoisie could not be overthrown by a frontal assault, nor could the proletariat be the vehicle of revolution. The Marxist myth that capitalism would fall inevitably of its own weight no longer held water. Marxists might publicly cleave to the old rhetoric, but privately they knew otherwise.

This was the situation in the early 1920s. Lenin's obsessive fear of Germany remained. His arrangements with General von Seekt and the Reichswehr did not reassure him. A new strategy was needed, and it was left to Willi Muenzenberg and the Comintern with the backing of Karl Radek and Felix Djerzhinski, head of the secret police, to develop it. Germany was to be the first target. The rise of Hitler, and in time the Cold War, shifted the focus to the United States. And thus was constructed the intellectual reactor whose critical mass would be dissatisfied Marxists, itching activists, self-hating Semites, dissident Freudians, and above all the discontented intellectuals recruited, organized and manipulated by what became known as the Frankfurt School.

★ ★ ★

[3]

Comrade Lukacs & The Road To Frankfurt

For Marxists everywhere, the early 1920s were a time of crisis. The Soviet Union, the icon of revolution, had survived, but just! Elsewhere in Europe, the great hopes of Marxist utopians had failed. The Bela Kun regime in Hungary had drowned in its own bloodletting — replaced by a brutal reactionary government which thumbed its nose at Moscow. Both Lenin and his Bolsheviks were ready to settle for hegemony in one country—if indeed they could salvage that much. For those who had plighted their troth to *die grosse Karl*, and who still believed that mankind's salvation lay in his turgid prophecies, it became obvious that the plans and projections and threats which had rampantly obsessed those who detrained at Petrograd's Finland Station, would have to be drastically revised.

The titular leaders could issue policy directives, point ideological fingers, and make plans for underground parties operating from Jacobin cellars. But it was Willi Muenzenberg, operational head of the Communist International, who applied his organizational genius and wily understanding of the West's weaknesses to set up the "transmission belts," the "front groups," the Comintern-run network of "innocents," and the propaganda and subversive cover for the Soviet Union, making it an international force when

its armies could not have fought their way out of a paper bag and to create the instrument for the dissolution of the West.

Intellectual ballyhoo artists could celebrate the Bolshevik revolution, as did Lincoln Steffans, the "great muckraker," in his comfortable *wagon-lit*. "I have seen the future and it works," he proclaimed to the American diplomat William C. Bullitt, before they arrived in Petrograd on their maiden trip to Russia. But the "huddled masses" had shown themselves unwilling to rise to the Bolshevik bait. Marx's historical determinism had prophesied a path from barbarism to feudalism to capitalism to socialism, but it had reached a dead end. The question for Lenin and the Kremlin, in putting aside their hopes for a frontal assault on Britain, France, America, and the rest of the West, became: "What shall replace the old strategy?" There were complexities to the question and to any possible solution. At that point, as the still-secluded Seekt papers prove, Germany and Soviet Russia were propping each other up. But Lenin did not trust the Reichswehr and the Reichsbank. Any new strategy would have to put a slow-working poison into the Weimar Republic's porridge.

Lenin Turns to Muenzenberg

Already physically failing, Lenin turned to Willi Muenzenberg and the Comintern to devise the strategy and the plan—subject, of course to his approval. Muenzenberg was vital in such a project, for the Comintern would have to be the instrument to implement any new secret moves. He had first-hand knowledge of the political situation east of the Rhine and the necessary personal contacts. Of even greater importance was his control over Comintern funds, and his ability to siphon money from local parties and local causes. According to Comintern archives, some made available since the "collapse" of the Soviet Union, more than 20 percent of the contributions raised in America for Russian "famine relief" were delivered to one "W. Muenzenberg."

Willi Muenzenberg's genius was to draw the "innocents" and the "fellow travelers" into propagandistic organizations, "transmission belts" and/or combinations of both. Over the years, and until he was liquidated by Joseph Stalin, he created groups that passed the hat for causes that would seem worthy to the uninformed — the proceeds all going into the Comintern treasury. He

founded magazines such as the *Arbeiter Illustrierte,* selling a carefully-disguised Party line to a million Germans; he published two daily papers in Berlin; he organized mass protests against "murderous" America and for Sacco and Vanzetti; he drew millions of dollars from generous liberals and outright Communists in Hollywood; he secretly published *PM,* a New York propaganda newspaper funded originally by American millionaires, directed from a suite in Fifth Avenue's posh Plaza Hotel by Lillian Hellman and Dashiel Hammett; he worked alternately with the Nazis during the Hitler-Stalin Pact period and with British Intelligence after Hitler invaded the Soviet Union; he bought editors and newsmen by the score; and he did more to poison the wells of public opinion than any other agent of the Soviets

Late in 1922, a meeting ordered by Lenin was held at Moscow's Marx-Engels Institute—a meeting disastrous to Western civilization and culture. Present were Muenzenberg and Georg Lukacs, former Commissar of Culture in the Bela Kun regime in Hungary and a profound believer in what Miguel de Unamuno had sardonically noted — that "[m]adness ceases to be madness when it becomes collective." For years, he had strutted among Hungarian and Austro-German intellectuals—flirting with philosophical concepts of left and right—associated with Martin Heidegger, whose lucubrations led him into the Nazi Party. Lukacs contribution to philosophical ideology was slight and consisted mostly of an unfinished book on Dostoevsky—but he had somehow achieved the reputation of being an "aesthetic pope," "a gravedigger of the social order," and derisively, a "cat's-cradle philosopher."

Born Gyorgy Lowinger on 13 April 1885—two years after the death of Karl Marx and circumcised eight days later—his mother belonged to one of the richest Hungarian Jewish families, his father was a self-made tycoon. Like others of his generation, he had a passionate hatred of his parents—against whom, as he put it, he waged "guerrilla warfare," and like Karl Marx and later radical intellectual exhibited a virulent hatred of Jews—to him "caricatures of the bourgeoisie." He had other hatreds and obsessions. "Woman," he would pontificate, "is the enemy. Healthy love dies in marriage, which is a business transaction. . . . The bourgeois family gives off swamp vapors." Describing himself as a "theatromaniac," he characterized the theater as the instrument for the

destruction of religion and of the "plague of Western tradition." Democracy, he preached, was "the apotheosis of egotism," suicide "the only reality." And he quoted approvingly the words of a Hungarian poet, "People sit in the lavatory of ideas and esthetic flatulence blasts from them. They live in a mystical cellar where cockroaches of the spirit crawl in the metaphysical sand."

"All to the good," Lukacs exclaimed about the Allied destruction of Central and Eastern Europe, "but who will defend us from Western civilization?" A fellow Hungarian had set as the goal of the future, "Eros, not Logos," but Lukacs argued, in what would be his lifetime theme, "Revolution and Eros"—destruction and sex. His hated father had bought him a university degree and when war broke out had saved him from military service. In December of 1918, he joined the Hungarian Communist Party, and carried with him Party card #52. His timing was good and bad. A handful of years later, he became a leader of a Hungarian Soviet regime which lasted only 133 days. The Bela Kun revolution took Lukacs out of the realm of philosophical masturbation and into practical politics. As Commissar of Culture, he worked with another dedicated Comintern agent, Sandor Korda (later to be Sir Alexander Korda, a film industry mogul and a top-ranking Soviet mole in British intelligence). Among his first acts as cultural commissar was banning all "bourgeois" newspapers, ending religious instruction of the young, "freeing" children of parental authority, censoring libraries, and introducing "sex education"—"go get it, kids"— into the elementary school curriculum, and forcing writers into "guilds" which dictated what they could or could not write.

Armed soldiers were authorized to loot the cultural possessions of the country. Some 1,000 paintings and 2,000 *objects d'art* were seized by his Cultural Ministry. with one collector robbed of nine El Grecos, three Delacroix, eight Monets, six Renoirs, and two Cézannes. "The proletarian state must deal with freedom [in the arts] as it does with banks and prostitution," Lukacs declared. Visiting the front, where Hungarian troops battled Czechs and Slovaks, he wore plus-fours—as if to a golfing match—and green stockings, to the jeers of the troops.

When the Bela Kun regime collapsed, deprived of military support by Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviks and rejected by all classes in Hungary, Georg Lukacs fled to Vienna, with forged

papers and money provided by his father. He was followed by charges from the reactionary Hungarian government of 236 murders, 19 robberies, forging currency, and violating all civil rights. Thomas Mann and other prominent German intellectuals later to join him in the Frankfurt School saved him from extradition, though the Austrian Communist Party wanted no part of him. Party leader Ruth Fischer described Bela Kun and Lukacs, as "revolutionary scum."

"The proletarian revolution failed," Lukacs orated, "because it shed too little blood. The White Terror [which followed the Bolsheviks] is the desperate measure of a desperate class to confound the verdict of history." His own Red Terror was "constructive humanism." And he averred, "The greater and more intense the [revolutionary] terror, the shorter its duration. Russia appears to be traveling that road."

For several years, Georg Lukacs wandered among the ruins of Central Europe, moving from haven to haven with a revolver in his pocket—a weapon, he modestly announced, to blast Western civilization to Kingdom Come. In Lukacs's "visits" to Germany, he was derisively considered an *apparatchik*. But Willi Muenzenberg, who never threw away a possible asset, stood by him, and he was repeatedly summoned to Moscow to take part in missions which combined mysticism and mayhem.

The Blueprint

The other key figures at the Marx-Engels Institute represented a critical amalgam.[1] They included Karl Radek, a powerful member of the Politburo, who represented Lenin. Felix Djerzhinski founder of the Cheka and the OGPU, ensured that whatever strategy emerged, it would be part of the worldwide secret police network he was building. Organization and operational know-how were Willi Muenzenberg's forte. Georg Lukacs had field knowledge, and ties to Germany's writers, artists, and intellectuals. And backing them were the foremost intellectual theoreticians of the Marx-Engels Institute.

What this formidable quartet sought was a formula that would at once fill tactical needs and also offer a strategy that would inure to the gutting of the German will and political principle. Such a strategy would remove the danger of any U.S.-French-German

alliance and would have the long-term effect of so morally corrupting Western world that it would fall without a shot. What emerged from that meeting would never be openly discussed in the deliberations of the Politburo or adumbrated in propaganda tracts like Lenin's *What Is To Be Done* or *State and Revolution*. But it did not take long debate or agonizing soul-searching to agree that the solution was not to be found in the involuted economic analyses of *Das Kapital*.

In creating the blueprint, both Muenzenberg and Lukacs would make major contributions. They both knew that societies and civilizations are not propelled by mass movements. The Bolshevik revolution had not been brought about by popular demonstrations but by the minority overthrow of the Kerensky government, by the corruption of the ruling class, and by the erosion of that class's faith in itself and its will to hold power. Lenin's theoretical journal, *Iskra* which contributed materially to bringing down the imperial regime, had in 1917 a circulation of 3,000 — most of them intellectuals. The obstacle to the disintegration, corruption, and erosion in the West—the cultural time bomb—was not the state power, which concerns itself solely with its preservation.

The obstacle was Western civilization itself, and the culture it engendered. Western civilization was made up of many mansions—the morality that derives from the Old and New Testaments, the traditional family, the respect for the past as a guide to the future, the restraint of man's baser instincts, and a socio-political organization which guaranteed freedom without license. Of these obstacles, the two greatest were God and the family. Dostoevsky, a hero to Lukacs, had written that "if there is no God, then everything is possible," everything is allowable. The family was not only a receptacle of the continuity in values, but the cement which held society together—and Lukacs hotly hated both God and the family.

The ideology of the Muenzenburg-Lukacs plan was embodied in the writings and preachments of the 1843 Marx, before he launched into pseudo-scientific economic history—*the ruthless destruction of everything existing*. For the cabal meeting in a room in the Mark-Engels Institute, historical determinism ordained this destructionism. Then, with Western man "liberated" of his humanity and rooting in the mud, the West would founder, ceasing to be a threat to the Bolsheviks, and a new, "politically correct" so-

ciety would arise. This doctrine could not go by the name of Marxism, so not to offend the Kremlin it was touted as *neo-Marxism.*

The start of the conceptual debasement of man's sexual instincts had already begun with Sigmund Freud. But Freud deplored much of what his researches seemed to indicate, whereas under the dispensation of neo-Marxism, they were to be glorified. Sex, the most explosive aspect of the human psyche, was to be unleashed and *homo sapiens* returned to the trees with *pithecanthropus erectus* — and this was to be called *neo-Freudianism,* in amalgam with neo-Marxism. The original target of this monstrous *Kulturkampf* was Germany.

For Georg Lukacs, whose interest was not in a Marxist Eden but in a universal holocaust, came the inspiration which after the Second World War cropped up in America as a semi-clandestine Satanism. The organizational aspects were Muenzenberg's. He was walking on dangerous grounds, for any movement eschewing classical Marxism would at some point seem to be clashing with "official" Marxist-Leninism and deal in soft-spoken criticism of the Soviet "paradise." But he realized, too, that this criticism could, in fact, be used to defend the "movement" by arguing that its ideological counterpoint would prove its freedom from the Kremlin.

The prime focus was education. Through the universities and the teachers' colleges, the new strategy would have its greatest and most enduring impact. "We must organize the intellectuals," Willi told Ruth Fischer after the Moscow meetings, as she reported to this writer. The intellectuals were the key to any hidden assault on Western civilization and culture. An academic base for the new endeavor was both essential and mandatory. The intellectuals had their own means of communication, they spoke in a *lingua franca* of their own, and they had been eternally at odds with society since the days of Socrates. Class war could engage the attention of fanatics. But only the intellectuals could manipulate the culture and as an immediate prospect paralyze any action against the "worker's paradise," while systematically destroying the systems and societies which stood in the way of Western collapse and the ultimate victory of neo-Marxism. The intellectuals would not battle for *Das Kapital.* But as Julien Benda would demonstrate brilliantly in *La trahison des Clercs,* they were not only bitter and deracinated, but in a key position to turn on the culture that had nourished them.

At the Moscow meeting, Muenzenberg proposed the instrumentality for the new endeavor. He had in his back pocket "socially conscious" multi-millionaires ready to give of their substance, much as the heirs to the Ford, Rockefeller, Field, and Lamont fortunes would in later years. And before them, there was the experience of the "generosity" of the Reichsbank and other international banking interests which had looked for a sound return on the millions they had given to pull Russia out of the Great War. On tap was a Red capitalist who had contributed happily to the purchase of the rope which would hang them all. He was Felix Weill, an eager "angel" of organizations working for *der rote Tag*.

Felix Weill had already been approached and was ready to put up the seed money for an "Institute for Marxism" which would be foisted on the German educational system. But this had been vetoed, the argument being that the Marxist allusion would defeat the pretense of an "objective" body of "scholars" studying the shifting tides of European polity. "Willi never wanted to give away the plot," Ruth Fischer said of him. There would be an "Institute"—this academic designation would appeal to a country where even "herr" was considered a title. Something innocuous like the "Institute for Social Research" would better serve the Comintern's purposes, and draw in intellectuals not yet quite comfortable with Marxism-Leninism yet still cleaving to the dialectic.

But Willi Muenzenberg was silent about one of his aims in the discussions of the Institute for Social Research. Beyond its concealed purpose, there was a more practical one. An organization such as he planned would have access to the academic and artistic world, and this access could be used as a transmission belt for his other operations. Lodged in the great universities of the West—Cambridge in England, for example, and the Sorbonne in France—were the beginnings of intelligence and subversion *apparats*. Seemingly innocent communications and directions could emanate from the Institute without alerting the West's feeble counter-intelligence or arousing suspicion. The first step towards what Lukacs boasted would be the "abolition of culture" having been taken, the next was to move from the Marx-Engels Institute to the actuality of the Institute at Frankfurt University, stamped and sealed by the Prussian government.

★ ★ ★

[4]

In the Beginning

Fresh from contributing to the tragic errors of the Versailles Treaty and beginning a career of misbegotten policies and wrong prophecies, Walter Lippmann delivered himself of an analysis of the State of the World and the time's political pregnancies in an article for the 21 August 1920 issue of *The New Republic.* The magazine was then at the height of its influence, edited by Herbert Croly whose "progressivism" disguised a belief in a state socialism which, Edmund Wilson in its pages summed it up without a wink: "If we are to save the democratic ideal, we must work out a systematic curtailment of the rights of everyone in the interests of all." The Lippmann screed, bathed in the waters of Fabian logic offered the dying Wilson Administration a foreign policy:

> Here is being played in Europe a great and intricate game of diplomatic chess. . . . The great stakes are the economic future of Germany, the political affiliations of Central Europe, and the Russian borderlands . . . and the penetration of Middle Asia, of China. The central position and what strategists call the minor lines are held by Russia. It is impossible to reach an agreement without the consent of Russia. Ever since the collapse of militarism in Central Europe this has been the master key to world politics. . . .
>
> In one sense agreement with Russia is not difficult. Soviet Russia differs from imperial Russia in that it is not inspired by the orthodox

> motives of imperialism. Its system of property relations is such that no class in Russia at present has political influence enough to secure government backing for the exploitation of a backward people. . . . The difficulty in reaching an agreement is of another kind. Soviet Russia is feared because of the Third International. There is some ground for this fear. But there is a deeper fear . . . of the influence of an example of a communist success. . . . The mind of the western world, conservative and liberal, is neurotic about Russia, needs a kind of psychoanalysis before it will be ready to deal with the new problems of Russia.

The date is important—August of 1920. Two years later, after the secret conference in Moscow, Lukacs journeyed to Berlin on a recruitment mission and to enlist the support of Thomas Mann and others of the deracinated quasi- and crypto-Marxist literati, intellectuals, and artists. The excesses of the Bolshevik revolution and the turgid illogic of Hegel's Procrustean philosophical system—a system that did away with a conflicting history by proclaiming it to be "a-historic"—led Lukacs to make a major concession. "Admit for the sake of argument that all the particular affirmations of Marx have been shown to be factually inaccurate by modern scholarship," he asserted. Still it did not follow "for an instant" that this negated the validity of the faith.

"In Marxism, orthodoxy refers solely to *method*. It implies the scientific conviction that the Marxist dialectic is the right method of investigation, and that this method cannot be developed, perfected, or made more profound except in the tradition of its founder," he preached. Nowhere did Lukacs or his associates mention Marx's own statement, late in life, made to his son-in-law, Paul Lafargue: "Ce qu'il y a de certaine, c'est que moi, je suis pas Marxiste" ("What's clearly certain is that I myself am not a Marxist."). Nor could the emergent school of "neo-Marxism," in defending the so-called Marxist dialectic, hark back to its roots in Hegel—who by "dialectical" methods had "proved" in 1801 that iron increases in weight if magnetized, and that no planet could possibly exist between Mars and Jupiter—the first provably ridiculous by any student in a physics laboratory and the second by the prior astronomical discovery of Ceres.

With Lukacs and Muenzenberg standing by, the Institute for

Social Research opened its doors on 22 June 1924. Under the sanction of the socialist Prussian Cultural Ministry, the Institute began as an adjunct of Frankfurt University, thus giving it official academic status. Nominally headed by Carl Gruenberg, a tame "socialist" behind whom the Institute could presumably obscure its Comintern origins and subsequent financing. or its secret direction by Lukacs and its devotion to a "demonic" philosophy. Gruenberg announced that the Institute would be devoted to "purely scientific" Marxism, abjuring a "party-political" course or entering into the ideological battles of the left. In his inaugural address, Gruenberg orated: *Magnus ab integro saeculorum* ("A new order is being born of the fullness of time."). Adding to the Institute's luster was that, as a part of Frankfurt University it would offer its students graduate degrees in Marxist studies—the first to do so in Europe—and its direct ties with the Kremlin's Marx-Engels Institute, with which it would participate in a bi-national publishing house.

The Faculty

The faculty of the Institute and its associates should have given the plot away. They included such solid Marxist-Leninists as Max Horkheimer, who quickly took over direction of what already was being known as the Frankfurt School; Karl Wittfogel and his wife Rose, both open members of the German Communist Party; Erich Fromm, who contributed mightily to the amalgam of neo-Marxism and neo-Freudianism, in time a best-selling author and propagandist for that line in America; Hannah Arendt who, having edged away from Heidegger's Nazi bed and hearth, eventually set herself up as a minimizer of the Holocaust; Hanns Eisler, composer and activist, who in 1939 would write the score for the Communist Party pageant at New York's Madison Square Garden, following which he would be rewarded by a Hollywood contract, and after World War II write the national anthem for the German Democratic Republic; Julian Gumpertz and Paul Massing, successively married to NKVD espionage agent and recruiter Hede Eisler, divorced wife of Gerhart Eisler, the high-ranking Party functionary and director in the 1940s of Soviet and Comintern underground activities in the U.S.; Franz Neuman, then a Communist sociologist; Theodor Adorno, neo-Marxist theorist and

musicologist; Bertold Brecht, kingpin of the Berlin theater, whose play *Die Massnahme* proclaimed in the voice of Communist revelation "Sink into the mud; embrace the Butcher, but change the world. Blood, blood, blood must flow;" and Dr. Richard Sorge, already dipping more than a few toes in the espionage pool, and later to be Stalin's most effective spy during World War II.

To be fair to Carl Gruenberg's statement of purpose, the Institute for Social Research did not purvey economic Marxism, or the product of Soviet propagandists and their drumbeaters in Europe and America. What could inspire was Karl Marx's appeal to the Left intellectual's destructiveness and perversity. Lukacs, in his assessment of a "demonic" Marx had arrived at that point, and Lenin's Nechaevist commitment also agreed. Where the neo-Marxists differed from Marx was in his belief that the destruction of religion and society would be permanent, whereas the neo-Marxists pretended that the end of Western civilization would be but a step in the historical determinism which promised eventual Utopia.

The historical pudding would not only have to be eaten but vomited before Man could take over the pantheon of the gods. The QED would have to be in Marx's utterances and writing before he became an economic guru. And the product would eventually not be called "Marxist" or "neo-Marxist" but "Critical Theory." The great foundations would appreciate that fig-leaf after the Frankfurt School moved to New York And as has been previously noted, neo-Marxism stayed clear of Marx's alleged economic theorizing—and for a reason. The author of *Das Kapital*, it was known to competent economists, had suppressed much of the vital data which had passed through his hand during endless researches at the British Museum and falsified others. Given to fecal expletives—his favorites being *scheiss* and *dreck*—he repeatedly referred in conversation and in correspondence to the material which went into his great opus as "that economic shit." As late as 1930, even John Maynard Keynes, in his *Treatise on Money*, dismissed Marx as a crackpot in the "underworld of economic theory."

The Marxist system offered "proof" of the inevitability of the violent destruction of the existing order of society and to posit the inevitable manner in which that cataclysm would occur. The *leitmotif* in these sophomoric arguments was, as Nathaniel Weyl noted in *Karl Marx, Racist*, an effort to validate Marx's need to envi-

sion and luxuriate in a *total revolution of nihilism.* "By a revolution of nihilism," Weyl, himself a former *apparatchik* and a member of Mensa, wrote, "I mean one which is engineered not to create but to destroy; not from the love of anything or anybody, but from hatred of everything and everybody. This generalized destructiveness is much more common than one might at first suspect. . . . In the Red Brigades and their counterparts throughout the modern world [such as the Frankfurt School-inspired Weather Underground], we find highly-educated people, generally of upper-class or upper-middle-class origin, who have no positive program for society whatsoever except for a few generalized slogans, but whose dedication to death and destruction is abundantly proved by the mindless murders they perpetrate and their equally mindless and murderous attack on the social fabric."

The Frankfurt School turned to Marx's "doctrine," enunciated in a September 1843 article, written in the form of a letter to Arnold Ruge, his co-editor on the *Deutsche-Franzosische Jahrbucher* which they had jointly founded, and in the *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.* But it was far more dramatically stated in Marx's life, activities and prior writings. For if any *explication de texte* is needed to explain the motivation of Marx and his doctrines, it can be found in the envious hatred that marked his onslaught against God and the Ninth Commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Covet."

Start with Marx's education. At seventeen, young Karl was enrolled at the University of Bonn—a three-day journey from his home—where in short order he ran through an extraordinary large allowance, fell into debt, and became a heavy drinker and collegiate rowdy. Though his father, a highly successful attorney, urged him to study the natural sciences and public finance, Marx more or less studied Greek and Roman mythology, modern art, and the history of Roman and German law. After two semesters at Bonn, he convinced his father to transfer him to the more prestigious University of Berlin. His father's letter at the same time expresses admiration and respect for Karl intellectual powers but accuses him of being an embittered weakling, a complete egotist . . . and one "governed by a demon." Prophetically, he wrote that Karl's intellectual gifts could "produce caricatures: if restricted to the physical part—simpletons; if to the moral part—fanatical visionaries; and if to the intellectual part—learned boors! What

ground have you for [this embitterment]? Has not everything smiled at you ever since your cradle?"

At the University of Berlin, Karl carried a light *mélange* of courses on Euripides, Isaiah, and art history—with three semesters in which he attended no classes but hung around Berlin's *kaffee-klatches*. The father of "scientific socialism" had no interest in scientific method, immersing himself instead in metaphysics and the underside of religion. He worked hard at becoming a poet, but his verse was shot through with the necrophilia, the death-orientation which Erich Fromm, one of his twentieth century disciples, ascribed to Hitler and Heinrich Himmler. "The necrophilious personality," Fromm would write many decades later, "is obsessed with vermin, filth, and excrement"—as was Marx.

The only emotions he could express with validity were hatred of life and a call to destruction. In his poems, blood spurted from eyeballs, doom howled, skeletons were gnawed, voices roared crazily from marble tombs. The 'hero' of one poem, "Oulanem" sets out to annihilate both the world and its order. Oulanem is Satan and/or Marx, who must "shatter [the world] with his long-drawn curses." The universe "howls the burial song of its own death. / And we, the Apes of a cold God, still cherish / The Viper . . ." In other poems, the young Marx challenged God:

> I wish to avenge myself against the One who rules above . . .
> I wander Godlike through the ruins of the world . . .
> I feel equal to the creator.
> Everything in existence is worth being destroyed.

No wonder that Moses Hess, precursor of "scientific socialism," who had read the poems, could hail "Dr. Marx—my idol, who will give the last kick to medieval religion and politics." Or that Mikhail Bakunin could be inspired to write: "In this revolution we will have to awaken the Devil in the people, to stir up their basest passions. Our mission is to destroy, not to edify. The passion of destruction is a creative passion." Marx's dialectical obsession saw God as the *thesis*, Satan as the *antithesis*, and the *synthesis* of their conflict Marx.

As a Jew whose family had converted to Christianity, he believed that he had been liberated from his heredity. Throughout

his life, he preached the superiority of the Germanic "race"—hysterically arguing that the Slavs and Russians, the Arabs, the Latin, the Jews, the Asians, the mongrel British and Americans, should be the slaves of the social order he advocated. Much of National Socialism's murderous racism stemmed directly from a Marx whose attack against his political foes was that they were "niggers," "Jews," and representatives of what he saw as racial *dreck.* For the Frankfurt School, as it sought to dominate and corrupt Germany, this was grist for the mill, though it drastically changed its tune when it moved to New York and employed the cry of "anti-Semitism" to collect large contributions from the Rockefeller Foundation and the American Jewish Committee. Marx saw Christianity as a Jewish plot to drug the people, imposed on Rome by its ruling classes. "Political freedom as we now it today," Whittaker Chambers reminded us in the 1950s, "is a political reading of the Bible"—and this is what anguished Karl Marx.

Marx realized that the family was the cement which held society together, the basis of what Edmund Burke called "the little platoon" which in concert with other "little platoons" made up community and restrained state power. And he was aware that one of the forces that brought down Roman civilization was the sexual license and the rampant homosexuality which struck at the family structure.

A pseudo-Hegelian *Kritik,* written late in 1843, in a letter to his co-editor on the *Deutsche-Franzosische Jarhbucher* looked down his nose at the "communist utopias" then being proffered by other radical intellectuals, and this was followed by a *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.* Both bear some quotation, since it became gospel almost a century later to the Frankfurt School.

> In Germany, everything is being forcibly repressed . . . stupidity itself reigns supreme . . . hence it becomes ever clearer that a new gathering point must be sought for the really thinking and independent minds. I am convinced that our *plan* would meet a need . . . .Apart from the general anarchy which has erupted among the reformers, each is compelled to confess to himself that he has no clear conception of what the future should be. That, however, is the advantage of the new trend: that we do not attempt dogmatically to prefigure the future, but want to find the real new world through the criticism of

the old. . . . But if the designing of the future and the proclamation of ready-made solutions for all time is not our affair, then we realize all the more clearly what we have to accomplish in the present—I am speaking of a *ruthless criticism of everything existing*. . . .

Two circumstances cannot be denied. First, religion, and second, politics, arouse predominant interest in contemporary Germany. We must take these two subjects for a starting point . . . . Just as *religion* is the catalogue of the theoretical struggles of mankind, so the *political state* is the catalogue of its practical struggles. The political state thus expresses, within the confines of its form . . . all social struggles, needs, truth. Then we shall confront the world, not as doctrinaires, but with a new principle: "Here is the truth, bow down before it." . . . [Emphasis in the original]

The *Critique* of Hegel is more specific:

Religion is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the *illusory* happiness of man, is a demand for their real happiness . . . The criticism of religion is, therefore, *the embryonic criticism of this vale of tears* of which religion is the *halo*. . . . The criticism of religion disillusions man so that he will think, act, and fashion his reality as a man who has regained his reason. It is the *task of history*, therefore, once the *other-world of truth* has vanished, to establish the *truth of this world*. The immediate *task of philosophy*, which is in the service of history, is to unmask human self-alienation in its *secular form* now that it has been unmasked in its *sacred form*. Thus the criticism of religion [is transformed] into the *criticism of law*, and the *criticism of theology* into the *criticism of politics*.

The criticism which deals with this subject matter is criticism in a hand-to-hand fight; and in such a fight it is of no interest whether the adversary is of the same rank—all that matters is to *strike* him! . . . Material force can only be overthrown by material force; but theory itself becomes a material force when it is seized by the masses. . . . What proves beyond doubt the radicalism of German theory, and thus its practical energy, is that it begins from the resolute *positive* abolition of religion. The criticism of religion ends with the doctrine that *man is the supreme being for man*. It ends with the *categorical imperative to overthrow all those conditions*. . . . For a *popular revolution* and the *emancipation of a particular class* of civil society to coincide,

> for one class to represent the whole of society, another class must be made to concentrate in itself all the evils of society . . . a particular social sphere must be regarded as the *notorious crime* of the whole society, so that emancipation from this sphere appears as a general emancipation. For one class to be the liberating class *par excellence*, it is necessary that another class should openly be seen as the oppressing class. [Emphasis in the original]

Neo-Freudianism

This was the core of the Frankfurt's School's "Marxist" philosophy, and the nature of its drive. This and the blatant racism that was designed to appeal to German intellectuals. But the Frankfurt School added a new element to its version of early Marxism—a neo-Freudianism, coupled to a Pavlovian strategy and practices of brain-washing and indoctrination through manipulation of the mass media. Some of that was to come later, when the Frankfurt School had injected itself into America. But neo-Freudianism was a program of the Frankfurt School from its very beginning.

Disaffected Freudians, dissatisfied with the master's "conservatism" and "prudery," seized on his teaching, but gave them a reverse twist. Through psycho-analysis, Sigmund Freud had arrived at a theory of human sexuality as a factor in the neurotic and the psychotic, in the psychological ills of *some*. He was dealing with the individual psyche. The Oedipus complex, to cite one instance, was seen as a response to family aberrations, not as a universal condition. It could be cured or ameliorated by psychoanalysis. Repression and the diversion of normal sexual instincts in mental and psychosomatic illness required analysis which would explain them and teach the patient how to overcome them, thereby allowing him to lead life with a modicum of calm. Freudianism recognized that the sexual factor in the psyche could be a devastating force, threatening not only the individual but society as a whole.

The neo-Freudians, many of them gathered into the Berlin Psychiatric Institute, an adjunct of the Frankfurt School, rejected the individual basis of psychology and psychiatric treatment and substituted a *social psychology*. Some of Freud's followers were developing a theory of homosexuality which might lead to its eradication in most instances—but the neo-Freudians would have none of it. Human psychological ills were not the responsibility

of individuals but caused by the political and social repressions of capitalism. The Oedipus complex, as well as every other psychological trauma, was caused by the crimes of the international bankers, industrialized society, and the class structure.

Freud had inquired into "infant sexuality" as an aspect of a developing psyche, but he did not advocate the sexualization of toddlers. The neo-Freudians of the Frankfurt School early on advocated social and sexual revolution as a means of eradicating psychological trauma and infant thumb-sucking. Like Freud, they realized that sex could be a devastating instrument if allowed to run rampant—and so they advocated the elimination of all sexual restraints along with the destruction of the family, religion, and "bourgeois" morality. It is interesting that some of the early Frankfurters, who retained a vestige of religious feeling and some awareness of the toils of promiscuity lost them when psychoanalyzed by neo-Freudians. For them, the entire focus of life was sex and a perpetually sustained orgasm its acme.

All the guidelines that society had laid down to make sexuality an orderly part of existence were condemned as horrendous capitalist depravity. The neo-Marxist-neo-Freudians of the Frankfurt School preached as part of sexual and cultural "emancipation" a "new ethic," "the destruction of monogamy" and the "patriarchal" family. Only slightly tongue in cheek, Carl Jung characterized the neo-Freudian-neo-Marxist position. They believe, he said, that "the truly healthy state for the neurotic is sexual immorality." In time, this "emancipation" would become authoritarian, demanding promiscuity, as it is today in some colleges where Critical Theory has supplanted education.

The Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School imposed compulsory promiscuity on the second half of the Twentieth Century. Radical feminism, a direct product of the Frankfurt School, brought down the alleged "patriarchal" structure of society, introducing matriarchy and the debasement of men. In the guise of equality, this began the slow destruction of the West's ability to defend itself by putting brassieres and girdles on its military forces. The "sexual education" which Georg Lukacs had attempted to force on Hungary in the Bela Kun regime led to mass teenage pregnancies. One-parent families, justified by false arguments for "equality of the sexes" became the norm, contributing to what

the Frankfurt School deeply sought, and led to a dramatic rise in teenage crime. Homosexuality, since it struck at the family and child-bearing, was encouraged. Early sexual activity destroyed parental authority. Drugs which stimulated the gonads became pandemic.

Women's liberation, transmitted to the capitalist world by professional neo-Marxist agents, flourished. And none of this was accidental. For from the start, the Frankfurt School had preached that revolutions of the past had failed because those who made them still clung to an "authoritarianism bred by the patriarchal family"—an authoritarianism which could only be extirpated by being washed in the blood of neo-Freudian psychoanalysis.

But there was one more element to what would be the philosophy and the agenda of the Marxist school. Though promoted by Georg Lukacs, it was embodied in the *Catechism of the Revolution*—a twenty-five-hundred-word manifesto written by Bakunin and Nechaev and an integral part of Lenin's articles of war. Past its overblown rhetoric, describing the revolutionist as "absorbed by one passion—the revolution," the *Catechism* cut to basic principles and tactics:

"Our cause is terrible, complete, universal, and pitiless destruction. . . . Let us unite with the savage, criminal world"—as the Frankfurt School inspired and dominated the Weather Underground and the Black Panthers, through its Herbert Marcuse. "Engage in spy work . . . A revolutionist must infiltrate everywhere, in the upper and lower classes . . . in churches, in literature." Those members of the ruling class who might be of value were to be subjected to blackmail, intimidation, or flattery. And of great and pervasive importance:

> One may conspire with the liberals in accordance with their programs, pretending that one follows them blindly, and at the same time one should dominate them . . . compromise them to the utmost, so that no avenue of retreat opens for them, and then to use them as instruments for stirring up disturbances in the State . . . Doctrinaires, conspirators, revolutionists talking idly in groups must be continually pushed into making dangerous statements, the result of which would be the destruction of the majority and the real revolutionary training of a few.

Peter Verhovensky, a disciple of Nechaev and Bakunin, boast ed that "administrators, men of letters, they are many . . . an they don't know they belong to us." Was an ultra-liberal-left ist like Ralph Nader in thrall when, asked by Anna Mayo of th *Village Voice* in April of 1977, if he could provide a legal rational for the occupation of nuclear sites and the destruction of propert by rampaging leftists, he replied:

> What activists are trying to do is make new law based on the settle Anglo-Saxon tradition. That is, if someone tries to break into you house, you can retaliate lawfully. In the case of a nuclear reactor th self-defense is projective. But what are you going to do, wait unt radio activity is all over the place? Shouldn't you destroy propert before it destroys you? Here you are violating a minor law to ge judgment on a more important one, the way they did in the civ rights movement when they sat at those lunch counters. I'll make prediction: If they don't close those reactors down, we'll have civ war within five years.

This was the program of the Frankfurt School from its incep tion. This is what Willi Muenzenberg and Georg Lukacs brought t Germany, creating the Berlin of Bertold Brecht and his *Dreigroshe nopper*, a city whose blatant corruption, fostered by the Frankfu School, made it the sexually-rampant and pornographic capita of Europe. From all this evolved a strategy summed up by Jerr Rubin, vociferous leader of the "counterculture" which bega reducing America in the 1960s to moral and cultural impotence "We've combined youth, music, sex, drugs, and rebellion—an that's a combination hard to beat."

★ ★ ★

[5]

A Tree Grows in Weimar

In March of 1850, Karl Marx delivered an address to the Central Committee of the Communist League. Historians and critics of Marxism like Robert Payne argue that it "acted like a bomb with delayed fuse, exploding only in the twentieth century." Unlike much that has been written about Karl Marx, his theories, and his activities, this tells a forgotten story. The concepts and the strategies of the March Address proved to be an utter failure in the Germany to which they were directed. They failed everywhere—though a century later they returned to belabor the West—and would have failed in Russia but for the sentimentality of Alexander Kerensky, after Prince Lvov's provisional government had overturned Tsarism and surrendered control of the State to his moderate democratic party. When asked by this writer in the 1950s why he had allowed Lenin, Trotsky, and the Bolsheviks to take power, Kerensky answered: "I could easily have arrested them all and had them shot." But why had he not? "It would not have been democratic," he argued—and though he could have spared the world incalculable tragedy, he still felt he had done the right thing.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels had no such scruples, but their efforts to bring about a communist revolution in the politically turbulent years of 1848 and 1870 had equally been doomed. In part this was due to the good sense of Europe's people, to the turgidity of Marxist propaganda, and to Karl Marx's penchant for

causing conflict and for bringing destruction to every movement and organization with which he was involved. The bomb did explode in the Twentieth century, and historians are struck by Marx's demand that his followers "carry to the extreme the proposals of the democrats" so that their rule "will from the outset bear within it the seeds of its downfall"—a prediction which ironically eventually applied to the Leninist revolution itself. Browsing through what is considered a "germinal" manifesto, the question leaps out of the text that Marx was aware of its suicidal aspects, and that his youthful call for the death of Western civilization and culture was also based on his personal necrophilia. His analysis of the political situation in Germany is hardly one to call the "proletariat" into battle:

> The petty-bourgeois democratic party in Germany is very powerful; it comprises not only the great majority of the bourgeois inhabitants of the town, the small people in industry and trade, and the guild masters; it numbers among its followers also the peasants and the rural proletariat, insofar as the latter has not yet found a support in the independent urban proletariat.
>
> The relation of the revolutionary workers' party to the petty-bourgeois democrats is this: it marches together with them against the faction which it aims at overthrowing, it opposes them in everything whereby they seek to consolidate their position in their own interest. Far from desiring to revolutionize all society for the revolutionary proletarians, the democratic petty bourgeois drive for a change in the social conditions by means of which existing society will be made as tolerable and comfortable as possible [only] for them.
>
> The domination and speedy increase of capital is to be counteracted partly by restricting the right of inheritance and partly by transferring as many jobs as possible to the state . . . As far as the workers are concerned . . . the democratic petty bourgeois only desire better wages and a more secure existence for the workers . . . From the first moment of victory [of the Marxist party], mistrust must be directed no longer against the conquered reactionary party, but against the workers' previous allies.

Hardly an "Arise ye prisoners of starvation!" call.
The failure of the Spartacist "coup" in 1919 Germany, leading

to the brutal murders of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, two popular non-Bolshevik leaders, indicated clearly that the "revolution" as preached by Marx and Engels had no future even in a Germany full of demobilized and unemployed soldiers bitter over defeat and their straitened circumstances. For all the bravado of Leninist rhetoric at the time, it was clear that the clear hope for Marxists was to follow in the way of anarchic Georg Lukacs and the pragmatic Muenzenberg.

The Beginning

The only chance of success was in seducing the intellectuals, always (as noted) the most dissatisfied element in any society, to rally round the slogans of *kulturpessimissmus*. "Willi knew that you don't have to buy the intellectuals—you just have to flatter them," Ruth Fischer and those who knew him noted. And control of the intellectuals were what both Muenzenberg and Georg Lukacs brought to Germany in a pre-Frankfurt School aggregation, the *Erste Marxistiche Arbeitswoche* (First Marxist Work Week). Among those participating, and the full list reads like a *Who's Who* of Comintern and Cheka intellectuals, were Lukacs, Karl Korsch, Richard Sorge, Friedrich Pollock, Karl August Wittfogel, Konstantin Zetkin, Hede Gumpertz (formerly Eisler, later Massing, and then married to the editor of Germany's leading Communist newspaper, *Die Rote Fahne*), Max Horkheimer and Rose Wittfogel, who would be the librarian of the Frankfurt School. In the background were Joseph Pogany and Alexander Korda, both of the bloody Bela Kun regime, of which Pogany had been war commissar. From this assemblage grew the Institute for Social Research.

Some of those who gathered at the opening ceremonies at Frankfurt University for the formal opening of the Institute may have felt they were rolling the dice, uncertain as to what the political and economic chaos in the Weimar Republic and the rising force of National Socialism—as totalitarian and with its roots in very much the same earth as Bolshevism—would bring. The intellectuals were there, from Horkheimer to Wittfogel—as well as the espionage and subversion apparatus which Muenzenberg had included to provide camouflage for its operations. Even Martin Jay, in his laudatory history of the Institute, notes that Sorge's

participation "must have been a cover" for his secret Comintern and espionage work.

Friendly accounts of the genesis of the Institute, after its initial *Erste Marxistische Arbeitswoche* existence, hold that the financing at the start amounted to an annual 120,000 marks, or $30,000 according to the post-inflation exchange, all contributed by Hermann Weil, father of Felix Weil, angel for Communist causes during the Weimar days. Hermann had made millions of marks in Argentina before World War I and other millions afterward—miraculously surviving the disastrous inflation. During the war, he had sold the Kaiser on his concept of naval tactics, and he was known as the "father of submarine warfare." His endowment for the Institute, we are asked to believe, covered the costs of a building at Frankfurt University, of salaries for the director and the staff, and tuition and room-and-board of $50 a month for each student.

From time to time, Felix Weil might throw in a few more marks, but the arithmetic dictates that the Comintern was the basic source of Institute funds. Just the cost of Sorge's apparat work, the Institute's "cultural activities" in Berlin, and the outreach to British intellectuals and subversives, were far beyond Felix Weil's financial capacity. After the Institute moved to New York, much of its overt expenses were covered by Columbia University, by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, and by other corporate interests in the U.S. Its covert funds came from the millions Muenzenberg and the Comintern were extracting from "anti Nazi" front groups and the "innocents," fellow travelers, and Party members in Hollywood and elsewhere in the United States. In addition, the "independent" Institute was in its early days sharing the load of publication ventures with the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow.

The activities of Richard Sorge, Hede Massing, and other espionage operatives in the Frankfurt School, were at one time an important aspect of its work. Hede Massing, as those of us who knew her in the '50s and 60s, made no pretense to scholarship or understanding of the dialectic which was required of Institute associates—and had she been asked to discuss labor surplus value or any other Marxist theory she would have been baffled. An affair with Richard Sorge—and it would take a Leporello to recite his amatory *catálogo*—had brought her into the Intelligence *apparat*, and her method of recruitment was not convincement but seduction,

as her relations with Noel Field years demonstrated. The "revolutionary mattress" was an accepted part of Soviet espionage.

Sorge, like most of the Frankfurt School's adherents, grew up in affluence. He had not yet taken his exams for entrance into a university when the Great War broke out, and he enlisted. Like his contemporary, Erich Maria Remarque, author of *All Quiet on the Western Front*, he was politically energized by the first battles in Belgium where he was wounded. During his period of convalescence, he completed his secondary studies, but was returned to combat, this time to the routine campaign of killing Russians on the Eastern front. Wounded again, he returned to the civilian life of a Germany sinking into defeat and to what he called in his detailed confession to Japanese authorities—after arrest for organizing one of the most successful espionage operations of World War II—"the ignorant and supercilious representatives" of the German spirit. Wounded a third time, he was recruited by a Communist doctor who provided him with the works of Mark and Engels. With the war's end, he shifted back and forth between espionage and academic activity, in both of which he worked for the Comintern.

Because of his academic achievements, he was a natural to be assigned to the Institute for Social Research. But his role was not to be part of the Institute's sociological pyrotechnics. Its records nowhere disclose any academic activities other than "librarian." It was Sorge's job to journey regularly to Berlin, presumably to touch base with the German Communist Party (KPD), but in reality to meet secretly with one Vladimir von Petrov, a Comintern and military intelligence agent. Sorge's work as security guard for four visiting Comintern heavy hitters—Osip Pianitsky, Dmitri Manuilsky, Otto Kuusinen, and Solomon Lozovsky—brought him to the attention of Moscow's Intelligence high command and on Petrov's recommendation to Charles Howard "Dickie" Ellis, a rising Soviet mole in MI-6, as well as to the leaders of the growing Comintern group in the Fabian socialist movement; to the Cambridge and Oxford cabals which produced spies such as Kim Philby, Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean and poets such as W. H. Auden, Stephen Spender, and Christopher Isherwood; to Harold Laski and his cohorts in the London School of Economics; and to the Bloomsbury writers and intellectuals who Ambassador

William Bullitt would characterize in conversations with Alice Longworth and this writer as the "Homintern"—the Homosexual International, later to become an important part of the Frankfurt School's operations.

In 1925, Sorge was transferred to Moscow to train for his great career as World War II spy, operating as a Nazi agent in Tokyo but in fact working for Soviet military intelligence and reporting to Stalin such facts as the Japanese plan for an attack on Pearl Harbor. Sorge's involvement with the Frankfurt School was routine and significant. There were others who were part of the Frankfurt School for whom the revolution and the triumph of Marxism were not an intellectual exercise or a "contest of *nudniks*"—as one New York socialist intellectual would put it—but a deadly struggle. The men who made the Frankfurt School were not *nudniks*, and proved their ability by bringing organized depravity to America and the world.

The Frankfurt School had in its formative years a three-way mission. The first was immediately the most important to Moscow—as a cover and a transmission belt for the Comintern's secret agenda—working with Felix Djerzhinski's Cheka as it progressed to OGPU, GPU, NKVD, and finally to KGB hand-in-glove with the GRU, the Red Army's military intelligence arm, particularly its Fourth Bureau of which Sorge and Hede Gumpertz were a part, and which frequently collaborated with the Nazi Abwehr and the Gestapo. The second was to keep Germany in turmoil so that at no point could it shift its allegiance to the West. Thirdly, and as it turned out its greatest achievement, was to organize intellectuals into a deconstructionist movement. This force, motivated by the merger of neo-Marxist hatred and neo-Freudian sexual perversity, was headed *de facto* until 1929 and *de jure* after that, by Max Horkheimer. It was made up, as one bemused observer remarked, of "an anti-Jewish, anti-Christian, anti-God, anti-humanity Sanhedrin."

Horkheimer

Horkheimer, from the start the organizational leader, was born in 1895 of rich Jewish parents whom he detested as parents and for their Judaism. He projected his parental phobias into a philosophical "system" deriving from the turgid and often meaningless Hegelian dialectic and from the anti-parental and anti-

religious manias of the young Karl Marx. Sitting in the lap of capitalist luxury, Horkheimer attended three universities—Munich, Freiburg, and Frankfurt—and learned French and English on frequent trips to London and Paris, paid for by parental largesse. Turning his back on a family business which provided him with the wherewithal to pursue his studies in comfort, he demonstrated the focus of his ambition by writing fifteen unpublishable novels.

Military service for Horkheimer during the Great War included little more than being trained in the art of squads-right-squads-left on a parade ground. At his universities, his original field was Gestalt psychology, but this was not abstruse enough for him, and he moved on to the more complex acres of German philosophy, receiving his doctorate *summa cum laude* with a thesis on art. From there he gyrated to Hegelianism, a safe move since to date few have been able to master its meaning. Karl Marx, in his early writings, had invoked the Hegelian dialectic, but more in the mood of Macbeth's three weird sisters.[2]

Horkheimer swore that he never joined the German Communist Party, the KPD. But there was no necessity for this. Along with two other high-ranking *apparatchiks*, he is listed on the rolls of the Comintern as one of the *Rote Drei* (the Red Three), in Comintern intellectual circles as important as the *Rote Capelle* (the Red Orchestra) would be in espionage circles, prior to and during World War II the Kremlin's most effective espionage organization in Germany. As a not too downright disputant in the Institute's sociological debates, Horkheimer could be the ideological finger in the velvet glove of the joint iron hand of Georg Lukacs and Willi Muenzenberg. He could leave the nuts and bolts of Institute operations to Friedrich Pollock, one of the few economists on its staff, who was permitted to express criticism of the Soviet Union's failures to carry out the dictates of *Das Kapital*—and to have it discussed within the Institute—just so long as these criticisms were not publicly aired. The Institute, however, did publish Pollock's critical study of Soviet Marxism, *Die planwirtschaftlichen Versuche in der Soviet Union*. Like Horkheimer born of prosperous Jewish parents he rejected them along with Judaism. His education was academic but drowned in the thinking of the student Marxist movement that permeated Germany's universities even under the Kaiser.

Two others during the Institute's early years who exerted an important influence on its ideological concepts were Erich Fromm and Wilhelm Reich, both representing the neo-Freudian aspect of the Institute's Critical Theory. Fromm, perhaps the only Institute stalwart slow to accept its virulent anti-Semitism, had broken with Sigmund Freud's theories of individual responsibility for sexual and psychological aberrations, placing the blame on what he analyzed as repressive Judeo-Christian and Western culture. Reich accepted Freud's analysis of sexuality, but rejected *in toto* Freud's studies which posited as neurotic and psychotic the malfunctioning of the sexual drive in such manifestations as homosexuality, aggressive promiscuity, and hatred of father figures. The neo-Freudian espousal of matriarchy was the seed from which radical feminism and the women's liberation movement grew.

For Reich and his followers, the sole function of life was the orgasm. Any restraints, such as those imposed by the needs of the nuclear family, which stood in the way of total submission to the pleasure principle and the orgasm were repressive, fascistic, and destructive. He substituted for the social order a society of dogs in rut chasing each other. Aversion to religion was invoked in Reich's demands for boyhood sexuality. With deep conviction he preached: "The child who masturbates does not pray. The child who prays does not masturbate"—making it a rite and a duty. Masturbation as a social act was therefore essential as a means to battle religion and the family.

This corruption of psycho-sexual principles, when wedded to neo-Marxism's anti-religious and anti-cultural system, was the basis for the preachments of Herbert Marcuse, another purveyor of the Institute's Critical Theory. He became the guru and inspiration of the New Left in its war on education, religion, and the family in the 1960s, and its call for violence against all authority—beginning with a demand for a home and school environment in which the child was master. His leadership role in imposing Critical Theory on educational institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Brandeis, and the University of California became one of the Frankfurt School's most awesome successes. Learn by doing, an echo of John Dewey, was established as a priapic principle, and its manifesto was Marcuse's treatise, *Eros and Civilization*, a book

which confirmed his ideological and emotional leadership of the Weather Underground and the Black Panthers.

Also on the Institute's early table of organization was Karl Wittfogel, son of a Lutheran school teacher, who combined a brilliant academic career with energetic work as a KPD activist. Though at odds with Horkheimer, who considered him too wedded to traditional Marxist philosophy and not Hegelian enough, Wittfogel was highly respected by academia for his work in Asian studies. His book, *Economy and Society in China* was published by the Institute, but his ideologically objective study, *Oriental Despotism*, still considered a classic in its field, was rejected, and along with other of his books was not reviewed by the Institute. Several of Wittfogel's plays were produced by Erwin Piscator, an associate of the Institute's Kurt Weill-Bertold Brecht outreach into Berlin's theater. In America, Wittfogel would break with both the Institute and the Communist Party, and suffer for it at Columbia where he continued to teach.

A catalogue of those who launched the Institute for Social Research or who contributed heavily to the development of Critical Theory—Herbert Marcuse, Leo Lowenthal, Walter Benjamin, Franz Neumann, Julian Gumpertz, Hanns Eisler, Henryk Grossman, *inter alia*—has led to the conclusion by some that Marxism, Freudianism, and Critical Theory were an outgrowth of Judaism and the Talmud—an accusation embodied in *Mein Kampf*, and Nazism hate literature. In point of fact, those listed above were deracinated and psychologically-warped anti-Jews who like Karl Marx violently hated Judaism and their Jewish roots. Marxism and the Institute's Critical Theory ran profoundly against the Mosaic law and the teachings of the Talmud—as any study of the Pentateuch and the Talmudic writings reveals. The historical fact, moreover, is that the Frankfurt School took little notice of or exception to Hitler's anti-Jewish racism until it had moved to the United States and discovered that anti-anti-Semitism could be most lucrative.

It has been noted that the Frankfurt School's so-called Critical Theory turned away from the focus of Marxist dogma, and to an extent its Leninist variations of class war and "proletarian" dictatorship. From its beginnings, as has been noted, the Frankfurt School was not out to change the economic order as enunci-

ated in *Das Kapital* and Lenin's preachments. It had to a secret extent written off the Soviet Union as the source of the "revolution" the members of the Institute had sought as student activists. In *The Dialectical Imagination: The History of the Frankfurt School 1923-1950*, an official apologia and an account of the Institute's life and times, Martin Jay offers an expurgated account of the Institute's direction:

> The Institute focused its energies on what traditional Marxists had relegated to a secondary position, the cultural superstructure of modern society. This meant concentrating primarily on two problems: the structure and development of authority, and the emergence and proliferation of mass culture. But before such analysis could be satisfactorily completed, a gap in the classical Marxist mold of substructure and superstructure had to be filled. The missing link was psychological, and the theory the Institute chose to supply it with was Freud's.

This obscures what was the core and the *raison d'etre* of the Institute's Critical Theory. For Horkheimer and his associates were convinced that the economic aspects of Marx's theories would not even be germane until the entire culture on which Western civilization rested was eliminated. To repeat: the aim of the Frankfurt School was to destroy Western civilization and its culture, and in the chaos and moral anarchy that followed, to create a totally new social and moral order derived from neo-Marxism and neo-Freudianism, both of which would be the tools to make the Judeo-Christian basis of Western civilization "stink"—as Willi Muenzenberg had vowed. For this, a select reading of Freud's theories and discoveries in the human psyche had to be folded into the deconstructionism of neo-Marxism.

To this amalgam of the sociological and the psychiatric were to be incorporated the conclusions drawn from Ivan Pavlov's experiments on dogs, loudly applauded by Lenin, which were to be applied to men in the form of "psychopolitics" and "brainwashing." Much of this developed slowly, but it did not come fully to flower until the Institute moved to New York's Columbia University after the Nazi takeover of Germany, and will be treated in the account of the subsequent achievements of Horkheimer,

Erich Fromm, Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno & Co.

After 1929, when Horkheimer took official direction, the Institute published theoretical works, laying a general groundwork for what would be the thrust of its labors when it moved to the United States. In such matters as education, it had to move carefully for the Soviet Union was breathing down its neck. It could not forcefully advocate letting junior teach the teacher since in the Soviet Union education had become a method of force-fed indoctrination, with students being deliberately molded to submit to official authority In cultural matters, however, where the Kremlin might not take umbrage, the Institute pursued its nihilistic course. It was led by the Institute's Theodor Wiesengrund-Adorno—he later dropped the Wiesengrund—and to Horkheimer.

Adorno

Adorno was to come into his own as a maker of Critical Theory in his collaborative works with Erich Fromm and others on the "authoritarian personality" and on the war on "mass culture" when the Institute moved to America. Much of his theoretical work was plagiarized, but the Institute took little thought of this. His early field was musicology, and his writings then were characterized by Karl Popper and other left-wing critics as "simply talking trivialities in high-sounding language" and employing "the metaphysical pathos of obscurity." That obscurity was deliberate, for when clear translations were attempted, against his orders, they seemed to read as parodies, and his refusal to change his style was seen even by some of his associates as "a defense against making his arguments available for scrutiny."

A few quotations from his writings may clarify his view of life, art, and a "metacritique of epistemology"—which meant "going beyond the realm of philosophy *per se* into its social and historical underpinnings, without, however, reducing it to them in a vulgar sociology of language." But this "definition" led to a further "defining":

> Defining means that something objective, no matter what it may be in itself, is subjectively captured by means of a fixed concept. Hence the resistance offered to defining the subject and object. To determine

> their meanings takes reflection on the very things which definition cuts off for the sake of conceptual flexibility. Hence the advisability at the outset of taking up the words "subject" and "object" as the well-honed philosophical language hands them to us as historical sediment.

Clear?

As to "truth"—which to the Critical Theorists and neo-Marxists does not exist—this formulation:

> . . . truth in what might be called truth in a descriptive sense meant correspondence with things as they are, whereas in a normative sense it meant what they might be. . . . [W]ithin the dialectical description of the "is" there is the necessarily latent the normative "ought."

And of that interesting term in German philosophy, *dinglichkeit*, or "thinginess: "The total liquefaction of everything thinglike [*dinglich*] regressed to the subjectivism of the pure act. It hypothesized the indirect as the direct."

Adorno was against psychoanalytic therapy because, he pontificated, "it leads people to believe that their individual fate is in their own hands . . .In psychoanalysis, nothing is true except the exaggeration."

Adorno had some musical training, and he could compose after a fashion. He attached himself to Arnold Schoenberg and to atonality in general, turning away when Schoenberg moved to the barren and musically authoritarian ground of the twelve-tone cluster which, by barring the repetition of any note until the other twelve in the cluster had been sounded, bound the composer by rules so rigid that they held him in chains. Adorno could find some small virtues in Bach and Beethoven, but Stravinsky was consigned to outer darkness because he ignored the "alienation" and the "contradictions" of society. Music loses much of its validity when it strays too far from the dance, Ezra Pound observed in *The ABC of Reading*, but Stravinsky's recognition of this won him Adorno's bile. As for jazz—which Communists in the "swing" era tried to take over and which Adorno had heard only in its debased and decadent Berlin manifestations—he had only scorn. Ignorant

of its roots, Adorno found hot jazz "anti-democratic, falsely sexual," a "castration symbol," and a product of "penis envy."

What Adorno hated in jazz, and in what he called "commodity" music (both in the larger forms and in the popular), and in all mass culture, was that people responded to it. When the radio brought music into the home, he was twice as infuriated. Music should be a dialectical factor in moving people towards revolution, he held. The listener, he asserted, must leave the concert hall frustrated, bitter, and at odds with himself and with society—ready to commit suicide or man the barricades. He could mute these objections when working with Hanns Eisler, a fellow member of the Institute, though Eisler based his "revolutionary" themes on the very folk music which Adorno deplored. Nor did he object to the popular melodies of his fellow Critical Theorist Kurt Weill who reached the height of his popularity not for his colorless symphonies and other "serious" music, but for a little number, "September Song," written for Broadway's "mass culture".[3]

But this was to come later.

In the 1920s, the authoritative voice of Marxism and revolution was Karl Korsch, a socialist who was critical of both the Social Democrats and the KPD but who was highly respected by Horkheimer and those who would work with him at the Institute. Korsch had served with Weimar leaders in working out plans for the "socialization" of the German economy—but he had been impressed at Karl Radek's reaction when he arrived in Berlin on Lenin's mission of leading a "National Bolshevik" coup.

"Nine tenths of [Germany's] workers are taking part in the struggle against the government," Radek had reported with undocumented optimism. But he and other Communist leaders had also seen that worker enthusiasm, such as it was, did not guarantee the revolution they supported. "Socialism requires workers' councils, not only because it is socialistic but because it is democratic." Korsch argued. "Socialization," or total government control of the means of production, would simply be a system of "state capitalism" replacing the monopoly capitalism which a revolution would supplant. More immediate were Korsch's important practical questions: What is a socialist society and how is its economy organized? Lenin had never considered these ques-

tions when he was overthrowing Russia's semi-capitalist government, Korsch argued.

For the KPD, this was anathema. It was seen as criticism of the Soviet Union. The Institute read it as a patch on a capitalism which must be destroyed completely before the doors of Utopia could open. As the early Marx had preached, this was the prerequisite condition. The invocational words were "praxis," to be wedded to the theoretical by "reification," a word compounding the Latin *res* (thing) to *fy*, meaning to materialize—or back to the linguistic gymnastics of *dinglichkeit*. That they were invoking the Hegelian emperor's new clothes did not disturb the theorizers. Korsch also disagreed with the Institute as to the nature of National Socialism. The Institute, along with most neo-Marxists viewed National Socialism as the last gasp of capitalism—and the Nazis as a movement which would collapse even as it brought down the Weimar welfare state.

Korsch saw it as an "epochal phenomenon," a new form of oppression and a "counter-revolution" that would employ capitalist methods of production to crush the working class. That the KPD, backed by the Kremlin, was secretly working side by side with the Nazis in the assault on the Social Democrats, he held, was mistaken and dangerous. True, the new German army, under General von Seekt was in constant association with the Red Army, and the economies of the two countries were in close working alliance. But that was a matter of mutual defense against the Versailles Treaty and the capitalist West . As the debate simmered, the Frankfurt School saw Berlin as the laboratory, the testing ground, for its strategies and its theories, both neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian. It had risen from the pyre of the old Reich, and its fate would determine the future of Germany and the validity of Critical Theory.

★ ★ ★

[6]

The Paradoxes of Weimar, Neo-Marxism, and Nazism

It may be said that the greatest success of the Frankfurt School's neo-Marxism and neo-Freudianism was the triumph of Nazism. This is a paradox of considerable dimension, yet the history of the Weimar Republic and the steps whereby Critical Theory rose and fell in the laboratory of Berlin and post-Versailles Germany bear it out. Had Soviet policy, as reflected in the actions of both the German Communist Party (KPD) and the Frankfurt School, been different, Hitler might never have come to power. Had the Politburo in Moscow not been dominated by its passionate hatred of anything on the Left but itself, Adolf Hitler might have been contained—and Germany would have continued as a semi-socialist parliamentary democracy, with no dreams of Armageddon. Had the Nazis not seized control of the governmental structure, the Comintern apparatus which included the Frankfurt School would never have been dispersed through Europe and America, or achieved its unheard of successes.

The ultimate irony lies in this historical fact, suppressed by the KPD, the intellectual *apparat* of the Frankfurt School, and their apologists: The Communists worked mightily with the Nazis to bring down the Weimar Republic—the KPD politically, the Institute culturally—convinced that they and not National Socialism would arise phoenix-like out of the ashes of Weimar. No wonder

that as *der Tag* approached intellectual leaders like Martin Heidegger and Hannah Arendt, who had held hands with the Institute, swung over to the Nazis. That hidden by a war of words there were affinities between the KPD and the Nazis was acknowledged by Adolf Hitler who, in conversation with Hermann Rauschnig, remarked, "There is more that binds us to Bolshevism than that separates us from it. I have given orders that former Communists are to be admitted to the [Nazi] Party at once. The petty bourgeoisie, Social Democrats, and the union boss will never make a National Socialist, but the Communist always will."

The facts of the Weimar Republic's sad history are immutable.

On 9 November 1918, Philip Schneidermann, the Social Democratic leader, proclaimed the Weimar Republic, with no authority, as it turned out, but with sufficient muscle to prevent the Communists from seizing power. Appeals had earlier been made to Woodrow Wilson by the Reichstag and the military to declare an armistice based on his Fourteen Points, but either the President was wool-gathering or blocked by the *revanchiste* French and his curiously-motivated adviser, Colonel Edward House. Even earlier the Reichstag had voted for a "peace with understanding," but this too had been ignored since it would have deprived Georges Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Woodrow Wilson of their territorial goals.

The Central Powers had sacrificed 1.8 million dead and more than 4 million wounded, and the losses in materiel and in human tragedy were incalculable. In Germany, sailors were mutinying at the Kiel naval base; leaderless soldiers were roaming the streets; and "revolutionary" provincial governments, as well as Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, were erupting in Bavaria and elsewhere in the Reich. The Social Democratic Party, under Friedrich Ebert, struggled for a few months, then called an election for deputies to a constitutional convention on 19 January 1919. Aware that they would lose badly, the Communists boycotted the election, prepared to meet failure with a rousing "I-told-you-so." But of the Reichstag's 421 seats some 30 million Germans gave the Social Democrats 11.5 million votes, for 163 seats. The rest of the seats went to a scattering of parties, ranging from the Catholic Center

and the Democratic Party to the new People's Party, representing business and industrial interests.

This did not quiet a country seized by dissension and violence—and the assassination of two popular socialists, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, set off more violent disturbances. The Versailles Treaty, whose harsh and unreasonable terms left Germans stunned and vindictive, added to the social turbulence. Nevertheless, by 11 August 1919, a reasonably viable constitution had been adopted and went into effect. It called for a strong executive but included self-defeating provisions like proportional representation which encourages political splinter parties, but seemingly favored the middle class over the "proletariat." Proportional representation, an electoral device to give muscle to the unrepresentative, brought chaos back to the fore, as has happened everywhere it has been tried. In the 1920 elections, the splinter parties wrecked the Weimar coalition. The Social Democrats were swamped and the new government was led by the Catholic Center Party. But no government could survive the onslaught of the Allied powers which, in the guise of enforcing the heavy reparations imposed on Germany, reoccupied the Ruhr.

That occupation fostered political disturbances which almost brought the German economy to a standstill and induced widespread unemployment and a total disruption of trade. By early 1923, inflation was out of control, and by the fall of that year, trillions of marks were necessary to buy a loaf of bread or a postage stamp. Economic ruin was the fate of those who had accumulated savings, now worthless, and many businesses went into bankruptcy. Only the speculators made fortunes. Farmers refused to ship their produce, manufacturing almost ceased, and food riots became epidemic. In mid-1923, President Ebert formed a coalition government under which stabilization of the currency was achieved and the economy began righting itself.

But again, this was challenged by a coup in Munich, the "beer hall *putsch*" of Hitler, Hermann Goering, and the repressive and demagogic General Ludendorf, in what was known as the National Socialist German Workers Party—a name which seemed to encompass everything, from nationalism to Marxism. The *putsch* failed but Ludendorff went scot free and Hitler, after a trial that was a propaganda extravaganza, was sentenced to five years, of

which he served only eight months. Nevertheless, what followed was a period of relative stability, even though Germany's political parties played governmental musical chairs.

The country moved ahead under the Dawes Plan, contrived by an American banker later to be Calvin Coolidge's Vice President. Under the plan, the occupation of the Ruhr was eventually ended, and government and the economy bolstered. In retrospect the "golden days" of Weimar began, and they survived the death of President Ebert and the succession by an overwhelming vote of General Paul von Hindenburg, a rightist reactionary, who as chief executive was reasonably scrupulous and effective until overtaken by senility. The Locarno Pact which followed seemed to settle all problems. Germany was admitted to the League of Nations and moved into a period of thriving industry, high wages, and low unemployment, with foreign investment pouring in.

But as the Social Democrats gained strength, they were beset by a secret coalition of extreme nationalists, Nazis, and Communists who declared war on the Republic. The Communists had, under orders from the Kremlin and the Comintern, refused cooperation with the regime and labeled the Social Democrats "Social Fascists." Defeated at the polls, the Nazis made deals with military leaders, industrialists who failed to understand the thrust of National Socialism, and agrarian monarchists. By 1929, in dealings mostly with the United States, Germany achieved its first independence from the Allied powers and arrived at a system of operations which, if continued, would not have ended until 1988.

Depression

On 3 October 1929, Chancellor Gustav Stresseman, who had paddled Germany down the perilous shoals of domestic and foreign policy, died, almost coincident with the Wall Street crash and the onset of world-wide depression. Measures taken by a conservative government under President Hindenburg sent the Communists and the Nazis into the streets, both seeking the destruction of the Republic and the end of non-totalitarian governmental power. All efforts to pull Germany out of the world-wide economic collapse were violently opposed by the Nazis and the Communists, both of whom envisioned the death of the Weimar Republic as the

From Daniel 5:25: You have been weighed measured and found wanting

birth of their own power. Elections on 14 September 1930 were the "*mene mene tekel*" on Germany's political wall. In heavy voting, the Social Democrats lost a half-million votes and ten seats in the Reichstag, but still held 132. The Catholic Center increased its seats from 78 to 87. The Communists gained more than a million votes but increased their delegation by only 23 to 77. The Nazis increased their vote from 800,000 to some 6.5 million, and their Reichstag delegation from 12 to 107. By October of 1931, the Nazis had brought to their cause industrialists such as Fritz Thyssen; commander of the German army General von Seekt; and financier Hjalmar Schacht.

The great Berlin Transport strike followed, launched by the Communists and aimed specifically at bringing down the government. The KPD was joined by the Nazis, and the two worked openly and enthusiastically in a ghastly "united front," literally linking arms in street demonstrations.. The Communists believed that they had lured the Nazis into their web, whereas in this most destructive assault on Weimar, the KPD had written its own obituary.

The next presidential election, on 13 March 1932, gave Hindenburg 18.5 million votes, Hitler 11.5 million votes, the Communists close to 5 million, and the extreme Nationalists 2.5 million. In the run-off election, Hindenburg won by 19 million, Hitler polled 13.5 million, and the Communists dropped by the wayside. New elections four months later gave the Nazis more than 13.5 million votes and 230 seats in the Reichstag, the Social Democrats 8 million votes and 133 seats. The Communists slumped.

An alliance of the anti-Nazi parties would have blocked Hitler. But the Communists persisted in their propaganda that the Social Democrats were Social Fascists. And they continued to hold that the fall of the Weimar Republic would result in the downfall of Hitler. From then on it was clear to everyone but the Communists that Hitler's accession to power was inevitable, and that stopping Hitler without concerted action by the non-Nazi parties was a forlorn hope. Through skullduggery, betrayal, the manipulation of President Hindenburg, and the torpidity of a German majority, Hitler achieved what he had predicted in *Mein Kampf*. National Socialism triumphed and the world rushed down the grim road to another world war.

So much for the political ambiance in which the Frankfurt

School operated, in a Weimar Republic that was truly said to be "an idea seeking to become a reality." Even as Germany fell to Hitler, the Communists and the Frankfurt School maintained that this was merely a prelude—first destruction, and from the ruins a Communists phoenix would arise. It was almost, but not quite as if an early Christian had said, "We must eliminate Christ in order to bring Christianity to the world."

The cultural, psychological, and sociological apotheosis of Weimar was Berlin, and Berlin was in the thrall of the *Institut fur Sozialforschung*. With the Institute, there was the Berlin Institute, branch of the International Psychoanalytical Association, which had broken with Freud's systems and joined the Frankfurt School in postulating that neurosis and psychosis (and all their aligned ills) sprang not from the miscongeries of ego, id, the Oedipus complex and other psychological maladies, but from authoritarian fathers, repressive religion, morality, and the by-products of capitalism.

The *Psychoanalitische Institut* in Berlin became an adjunct of the Frankfurt School. Under Otto Fenichel, its guru, it developed the theories of "political Freudianism"—more politely put "neo-Freudianism." Where Sigmund Freud sought to cure neurosis and psychosis by adjusting patients to their environment, the Berlin Institute exacerbated their condition by driving them to war with society. Among their number were men like Otto Gross—described in one of Franz Werfel's novels as "a wretch, a dope fiend, rather mad, and yet—he was great in himself." With varying degrees of emphasis, the Berlin Psychoanalytical Institute preached a doctrine of sexual and cultural "emancipation" in which "the truly healthy state for the neurotic is sexual immorality." This Gross also argued, to the approving nods of the Frankfurt School and his fellow workers at the Berlin Institute. Championed was a "new ethic" based on "the destruction of monogamy" and of "authoritarian institutions" such as the family and religion, and holding that "the psychology of the unconscious is the philosophy of revolution"—whatever that means.

The Frankfurt School had begun to assert, as a part of neo-Marxism and the writings of Georg Lukacs, that revolutions of the past had failed because the revolutionists were still dominated by an internal "authoritarianism" instilled in them by the

"patriarchal" family. In their subconscious, the earlier revolutionist harbored the very authority they were subverting, and they could only free themselves of this, according to the Frankfurt School, by tomcatting and neo-psychoanalysis. The next revolution would first have to depose the father and install the mother. Siegfried Bernfeld, an associate of Otto Fenichel, plumped for "school reform" which would free students from sexual "repression" and the parental "domination" of the family.

Years later, it would be argued that all the elements of Berlin's unregenerate decadence had existed before the outbreak of the Great War and were to be found in the works of Baudelaire, the Marquis de Sade, the early Thomas Mann, and everywhere that there was a cesspool in Europe. If this was so, as the Institute and the Psychoanalytical Association claimed, they had been carefully gathered up and deposited on the steps of the Reichstag building. Every aspect of what we now dignify as "lifestyle" were dominated by the Institute's people, either directly or through Willi Muenzenberg and the Comintern's cultural *apparat* which orchestrated the Frankfurt School's activities. One need only examine the cast of characters in Weimar Berlin to arrive at this conclusion. Lenin had said, in the early days of the Russian Revolution, that he could not listen to the music of Beethoven because it made him love people, and the Institute set out to make Berlin his home, not only musically, but in all culture.

The path the Frankfurt School had been taking was guardedly stated by Max Horkheimer, in the speech he delivered when assuming overt control of the Institute. Peter Jay, in his approving *Weimar Culture*, warns that Horkheimer's remarks were "Aesopean," the term of art for Marxist double-talk. But Horkheimer was frank enough to assert that the Institute's function was to go beyond intellectual research and enter, as it were, the field of battle, a battle in which "philosophers, sociologists, economists, historians, and psychologists could join in permanent collaboration."[4] That collaboration had begun after Berlin emerged from bloodletting and inflation. Looking back at the Institute, Jay states correctly that it was "a group of powerful intellects." Until the advent of Hitlerism, there was scarcely a writer, artist, entertainer, actor, dramatist, or intellectuals in Germany who did not have some kind of tie, whether formal or casual, to the Institute.

Berlin

Berlin was the core, the center of Germany's intellectual, artistic, and cultural life. It was also the leader through the Berlin Psychoanalytical Institute in neo-Freudian psychoanalytic theory, but with a difference. Berlin had been completely Russified in *mores, ethos,* and character, until defeat and inflation had brought their moral consequences. Stephen Spender would write of the Berlin that was in the early to mid-1920s:

> Nothing expressed the cynical relationship between the grim architecture and the feckless population more than the belief of Berliners that one of the stone lions outside the palace at the end of the Unter den Linden roared whenever a virgin walked by. Ilya Ehrenburg, the Soviet writer who fled the Bolsheviks and then was allowed to return would write of his Berlin experience: "I observed with what rapture pale, skinny adolescents watched the [movie] screen when rats gnawed a man to death or a venomous snake bit a lovely girl."

But it was not all palely loitering. The heirs to Germany's *Wandervogel* youth movement split into right and left, Nazi and Communist. The left manifestation created the first youth conflict, with some supporting the Weimar government and the Communists attacking it. The Communist youth, moreover, were guided by the Institute's program of turning the young against the "authoritarianism" of the "old"—and efforts were made to expel from the cadres and membership all those over 25, which decades later the New Left in the United States, whose guru was the Frankfurt School's Herbert Marcuse, would relent sufficiently by raising the cut-off age to thirty.

The writer Stefan Zweig, commenting on what had become of the staid Prussian capital, remarked: "All values were changed. Berlin was transformed into the Babylon of the world, the most immoral city in Europe." This, of course, had its appeal for many, particularly sexual aberrants. In the late 1960s, Christopher Isherwood recalled Berlin's corruption in his book, *Down There on a Visit,* quoting the warning of one of his relatives:

> I know Satanists when I see them—in the whole of the Thousand and One Nights, in the most shameless rituals of the Tantras, in the

> carvings on the Black Pagoda, in the Japanese brothel pictures, you couldn't find anything more nauseating than what goes on [in Berlin] and quite openly, every day. That city is doomed more surely than Sodom ever was. . . . Evil doesn't know itself there.

Isherwood's reaction, conditioned in part by the pull of his fellow homosexual, Wystan Auden and the knowledge that neo-Marxists controlled the culture, was: "Then and there, I made a decision that no matter how, I would get to Berlin just as soon as ever I could." As part of the Cambridge-Oxford group, he had already been approached by the Institute and was *au courant* with its work and ideology—which had already taken root in the London School of Economics with the blessings of Harold Laski. Among intellectual circles in England and France, it was known that Berlin's art, music, and drama were being directed by the Frankfurt School's colleagues and disciples, George Grosz, Weill, and Eisler, with Bertold Brecht perhaps foremost. The physical character of the city was also changing. Under the influence of Walter Gropius and the Bauhaus, young architects began designing and erecting deliberately bleak rectangular buildings, ugly and desperately functional down to the last brick, which only an "advanced" Berliner would accept. When the Bauhaus departed from its angularities it produced structures like the Albert Einstein Tower, which deliberately resembled a meaty phallus, a favorite symbol among Weimar artists.

Not all Berliners, or Germans for that matter, subscribed to the cultural ideology that spurted out of the Frankfurt School. The *volk* lived the same kind of lives under the Imperial Reich as they would under the Nazis—saying their "*Hoch der Kaiser!*" as routinely as they would chant "*Heil Hitler!*" But Berlin was the Frankfurt School's dream and plan, in microcosm, for Germany as it would be for the United States,. It was the testing ground for the Lukacs-Horkheimer Critical Theory and the elimination of family, morality, and religion. Anita Loos, the best-selling author of *Gentlemen Prefer Blondes*, would look about her and report, "Any Berlin lady of the streets might turn out to be a man; the prettiest girl on the street was Conrad Veidt who later became an international film star." The powdered and priapistic poet, Stefan George, a powerful esthetic force in Berlin, who paraded about

the city with his harem of pretty young men, did not participate in the ideological rituals of the Frankfurt School, and had as little use for its cultural gauleiters as they had for him, but his voice reinforced theirs.

On the one hand, there was the *cabaret* Berlin: night clubs in which nude waitresses not only served drinks but themselves to the customers, and prostitutes on the street snapping whips to entice masochists. On the other, Magnus Hirschfeld—a pseudo-scientific pornographer a few steps behind the Frankfurt School's Wilhelm Reich—whose well-funded Institute of Sexual Research plumped for nudism, homosexuality, sado-masochism, voluntary sterilization to eliminate the family, the sexual encouragement of children, and free psychoanalytic clinics to spread his gospel of Critical Theory. But what made Berlin what it was tapped other wells. German culture among them.

German art in the pre- and postwar period had called itself Dada, a meaningless word about a meaningless concept, and the Dadaist had proudly boasted that "any art that can be understood is the product of a journalist." Its prophet was Tristan Tzara, who would openly verify that "Dada has no meaning." Richard Huelseneck, one of its defenders, would ironically refer to it as "German Bolshevism" A lecture he delivered bore the title "Dada, Or Meaning in Chaos." In his Dada days, he would parade on the streets of Berlin wearing a death's head and carrying a sign, "*Dada über alles*." But Dada was not Bolshevik enough for George Grosz, who joined Zinoviev in his Soviet propaganda activities, later a fixture as the third in the Institute's cultural dictatorship, with Kurt Weill and Bertold Brecht. Reasonable men could not cleave to Dadaism for very long, and Grosz became a neo-Marxist—that is, someone who believed that his artistic mission was to destroy the society of which he was a part. Dada died with expressionism, but this was too "sentimental" for the flinty neo-Marxists, and Grosz changed his costume for American cowboy boots and spurs, smoking a corncob pipe.

His work was strident, cruel, and sometimes little more than political cartooning, aptly described by Otto Friedrich, a Grosz post-manicomium enthusiast, as "portraits of decay, corruption, lewdness, death. . . .There seem to be no workmen in Grosz's Berlin, no schoolchildren, no parks, no trees. There are no pretty girls,

just apathetic whores, or matrons with sagging breasts, who stand and wait for paunchy husbands in suspenders and underwear to finish brushing their teeth. There is nobody . . .only middle-aged businessmen with bristling mustaches and thick cigars; and officers with monocles and ruthless jaws, and often no trousers; and over and over again, sex murderers, real or potential, brandishing knives and hatchets. Even the buildings in Berlin become sinister in Grosz's drawings, hard towers of stone, usually tilted at threatening angles."

In music, the Communists had a near monopoly—but of what? Theodor Adorno and the Frankfurt School beat the drums for Arnold Schoenberg and two of his major disciples, Alban Berg and Anton Webern, but though they caused much hoopla among music critics, and even more misery for concert goers, their lasting influence was nil. Schoenberg moved from dissonance to atonality, and then to the Procrustean bed of the twelve-tone cluster. Eventually he abandoned this folly, participating in the Berlin cultural invasion of Hollywood after the Hitler-Stalin pact. Schoenberg could deliver himself of such nonsense as his comments on the Viennese composer and conductor Gustav Mahler: "If you are in a position to observe the way Mahler ties his tie, you can learn more counterpoint than you can in three years at the conservatory."[5]

In America, Schoenberg discovered that anti-Jewish Jews, such as he had been in Germany, were not popular. This resulted in two compositions: "Kol Nidre," and "A Survivor of Warsaw," a cantata on the Holocaust. In the Berlin *geist*, Schoenberg was joined by two Institute members, Otto Klemperer and Hanns Eisler, who paid little mind to the Institute's strictures on music. Klemperer was an excellent four-square conductor of Bach but made use of the professional clout which association with the Frankfort School provided. Hanns Eisler sought to turn the folk themes Adorno spurned into "revolutionary" music. Eisler, a dues-paying member of Willi Muenzenberg's *apparat*, was part of what might be called an agit-prop road show, organized by Muezenberg and produced by Erwin Piscator, whose theater was financed on and off by the Comintern. He set poems by Bertold Brecht to music, and was on hand to write songs for Muenzenberg's "causes." As in Frankfurt and Berlin, Eisler also acted as a sub-commissar and the Institute's representative for Muenzenberg's assistant, Otto

Katz (a.k.a. André Simone, a.k.a. Ludwig Breda), whose immediate theater of operations at the time was the stage and films.[7]

Frankfurt School "Letters"

There were novelists of importance—Thomas Mann, Franz Werfel, and Franz Kafka among them—to pass on the Institute's message. Mann, of course, was then the most important German novelist of his time, and his *Death in Venice*, *The Magic Mountain*, and other writings, contributed to the intellectual *angst* being promoted by the Frankfurt School. Horkheimer, in fact, was Mann's witness when he took the oath that made him an American citizen, and Mann once declared that Theodor Adorno was the inspiration for his final work, *Doctor Faustus*. But as Mark Twain would have said, Frank Kafka was no slouch, and his tales out of the manicomium became almost Talmudic for the New Left, particularly *The Trial*, a reworking of the legal proceedings against the certifiable Otto Gross, later also employed by the New Left as an indictment of "bourgeois justice." In Brecht's eyes Kafka was "the only truly Bolshevik author." Franz Werfel's *The Murderer* also dealt with the Gross Trial.[8]

But the focus of Weimar writers, and of the public, was on the theater, and here the Frankfurt School, through Bertold Brecht, was paramount. Until films, radio, and TV took over, the stage was the major medium for communication in Berlin, particularly among intellectuals, far more effective than the printed word of newspapers or magazines, though here too, through the Muenzenberg empire, which published Berlin's leading newspapers and magazines, it was dominant. The theater evoked emotion in a direct way, and had since the days of Ibsen been a vehicle for nihilistic expression,

Drama *gauleiter* for the Frankfurt School was Bertold Brecht (born Eugen Berthold Brecht), "small, slight figured, gangling and awkward, but with the shrewdly watchful eyes of a raccoon," a contemporary described him. "Strength—a pseudo-proletarian masculinity, rather aggressively asserted—formed the core of Brecht's carefully contrived image." To him there was no such thing as a middle-class proletarian, so he affected the costume of a truck-driver—cap and black leather jacket, and like Yasser Arafat, he always had a two-day stubble on his face, which in his Holly-

wood days was noted as "never clean-shaven, always a two-day growth, but mysteriously never a three-day-growth." His trademark was bad teeth and personal grime. To this he added, even in his days of American prosperity, cheap cigars which he usually chewed and dropped on the floor.

Lion Feuchtwanger, an early patron, wrote wonderingly, "It was a queer thing that he should be so popular with women. The man literally reeked of sweat and he smelled." Yet he had uncounted mistresses, fascinated by what Feuchtwanger described as his "vulgar ballads." His first play, *Drums in the Night*, produced in Munich in 1922—was written, according to Brecht just to make money. "The bagpipes play," his hero says, "the poor die among newspapers, houses fall down on them, morning dawns, they lie like drowned rats on the pavement. I'm a pig and the pig is going home."

His next play, *In the Jungle of the Cities*, was a Kafkaesque fantasy about an America of which Brecht had not the slightest knowledge, subtitled "A Boxing Match Between Two Men in the Giant City of Chicago." The "Chicagoans" of Brecht's drama are a Malayan lumber dealer, Skinny, the Baboon, the Worm, and a young man, George Garga, who works in a rental library. It ends in rape, arson, lynching, and suicide. What he was writing about was a tabloid version of Berlin.

The success of these two plays brought Brecht to Berlin where he went to work for Max Reinhardt's Deutsches Theater as its dramaturg, the playwright responsible for its repertory, even to writing its plays. Reinhardt was a fixture in Berlin's Marxist theater, though after his transplantation to America he discovered that anti-anti-Semitism was a viable product. Erwin Piscator's Proletarian Theater put on the boards an agit-prop drama by the Institute's Karl Wittfogel, in time becoming part of Brecht's Epic Theater. The proletarians at whom it was aimed, however, preferred escapism to revolutionary boiled cabbage.

Brecht, however, was interested in a "new" kind of theater—one in which the house lights remained on and the audience wandered smoking, belching, and chatting, while the actors merely offered their lines without any commitment to the play's theme—even in "Shakespearean" productions at London's Globe Theater. Brecht's next play was set in Florida, with music by Kurt Weill.

Its title was *The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny,* though the tree grew nowhere in the South in which it was presumably set. It did not match the great Berlin and Broadway success of *The Three-Penny Opera,* a Brecht-Weill proletarian view of John Gay's rollicking Eighteenth century *Beggar's Opera. The Three-Penny Opera* was "Cultural Bolshevism," reflecting the young Karl Marx's hatred of humanity. Its basic theme was of the double-cross, of corruption and hatred. "Women are Decoy Ducks, who can trust them! Beasts, Jades, Jilts, Furies, Whores." Macheath, now Mack the Knife, is a nihilist who declaims, "What is the burgling of a bank to the founding of a bank."

Die Massnahme, Brecht's agit-prop celebration of neo-Marxist murder, ideology, and corruption gave him his status as a poet and a dramatist, winning the applause of the liberals in Berlin and much later in New York. He subscribed completely to the Frankfurt School doctrine that the purpose of art, music, and literature was to destroy the bourgeoisie, to "organize pessimism," to "expel the moral metaphor" from life, and to create the *verfremdungskeffekt,* "the estrangement effect," so as to anger and disgust the audience.

Opera also became part of the Frankfurt School's fiefdom, with Otto Klemperer taking over the state-run Kroll-Oper. He and his followers staged such neo-Marxist works as Janacek's *From the House of the Dead,* Krenek's *Jonny Spielt Auf,* and Grosz's *Achtung, Aufnahme!* The ballet too came under the influence of the Institute. And so did the lower forms of music theater, with Max Reinhardt's Noise and Smoke night club prominent, with decor by Grosz, which he later re-did for New York's Cafe Society Uptown.

In his days as the covert dean of the Frankfurt School and less covert cultural commissar of Germany, Willi Muenzenberg had his eye on the cinema, which Lenin presciently saw as the most effective medium to mold and control culture. Films had wide and established distribution, the number of movie theaters in Germany multiplying tenfold from 1913 to the end of the Great War. They could make the clinking coins in the box office ring for the counting house of the Comintern. And Muenzenberg foresaw that the glamour which attached itself to filmdom's actors, producers, and directors could be harnessed by the Comintern through the

Frankfurt School, as they were when the Institute moved to the United States, and through Hollywood's Communist fronts.

Willi Muenzenberg had written *Conquer the Film,* which called on the proletariat to take over the new medium. He also set up the Prometheus Import Company which brought Soviet and other agit-prop movies to the West. His weekly *AIZ* touted productions by German and other film headliners and sponsored the visit of Charlie Chaplin, already in Moscow's thrall, to Germany where he was photographed with Frankfurt School figures.

The Berlin product was reinforced by Sandor Korda—later Sir Alexander, great London producer and already identified as a Soviet mole in MI-6. Muenzenberg and his associates in the Frankfurt School had subtler and more destructive aims. They wished to depict life as sordid and despairing and futile. Their vehicle was films such as *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari, The Blue Angel,* and *Metropolis,* which had tremendous success both in Germany and world-wide, projecting Marlene Dietrich, Peter Lorre, and Emil Jannings onto the American cinema.

The German production of *The Blue Angel* depicted Marlene as Lola, a cabaret tart who teased and tortured a middle-aged schoolteacher in ways characterized by a vulgar American expression. The film's theme was the sado-masochistic downfall and humiliation of a "puritan"—and in the climactic finale Emil Jannings, representing middle-class culture, is forced to totter on stage at Lola's cabaret and to act like a chicken while an egg is broken over his head. *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari,* now a classic of Weimar movie-making, is of more significant madness. It deals with a mysterious Caligari, traveling in a carnival with Cesare, a somnambulist who wanders about murdering anyone who speaks against Caligari. *Metropolis,* described as techno-utopian, portrays the society of the capitalist future as a mechanistic concentration camp. It is still hailed as high cinematic art.

To think of the Berlin operation as spontaneous, and with only a sympathetic and empathetic relation to the Frankfurt School misses the point. The liaison between the Institute and Berlin was Otto Katz (already identified) who was assigned by Muenzenberg and the Comintern to this task. Katz, a close friend of Bertold Brecht and a would-be poet and dramatist, stage-managed and directed Brecht's activities, as well as theater, films, architec-

ture, and all their ramifications. Katz brought the message and the clout of the Institute to Berlin, the cultural and ideological heart of Germany, as he would in the Thirties to Institute operations in New York, Hollywood, academia, and communications.

In the Weimar years, Berlin conditioned the psychology and the activism of the German people, particularly its intellectuals. Richard Lowenthal, who wrote for the Institute's *Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung* under assumed names, had rhetorical questions about Weimar Berlin: "What were the elements of Berlin in the 1920s? First Marxism and pacifism; then theater, art, and so on. The radical educational experiments, the creative intellectuals, Brecht for example, never really understood what was happening. One of the most striking things about the whole Weimar period is the gulf between the small minority and the general mood of the country." It was a small minority but it dominated Berlin, the capital of Germany, to whose tragedy it significantly contributed." Indeed, the Frankfurt School was a minority, but to move history, all that is needed is a lever and the proper fulcrum.

★ ★ ★

[7]

Outreach to London, MI-6 & the *Sonnenkinder*

When Willi Muenzenberg, Georg Lukacs, and Felix Djerzhinski met in Moscow to plan the establishment of an Institute for Social Research, each had his own interests in mind. Lukacs wished to destroy Western civilization according to Karl Marx's 1843 precepts. Muenzenberg saw a mobilization of intellectuals as an adjunct to Comintern aims and strategies; and Djerzhinski envisioned a spawning ground for hard-core espionage agents. The Institute was one element in the rings-within-rings of the Soviet assault. So complex is that assault, that reference to its British manifestation are filed under "the Cambridge spies" — though not all of the participants were involved in espionage. The rest of them offered camouflage, confusion, and political protection. And this was part of the plan. If someone, noting the ties between the poet W. H. Auden and Muenzenberg, were to call Auden an *apparatchik*, he would be wrong.

Auden never delivered diplomatic or political secrets to the *apparat*. Yet he and his associates deserve at least a little of the opprobrium, though not the legal responsibility, applied to Kim Philby & Co.. The activities of the Frankfurt School ranged from intellectual neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian intellectual calisthenics to actual ties with the dirty work. Max Horkheimer did not sit

at the elbow of Guy Burgess, but he did profit from these first exercises in betrayals and hatreds. He was fully aware of the liaison established by his own Richard Sorge with the real British traitors. And he was cognizant, as were the other leaders of the Institute, of the exact meaning and significance of the contacts between the Institute, the Comintern moles, and the corrupt *Sonnenkinder*, the romantically named but totally corrupt British "children of the sun." The Audens and their coterie merely made the "intellectual" activities of the Institute respectable.

A passage from Stephen Koch's *Double Lives* gives some insights into the process:

> It is often asked how so many of these privileged Englishmen could have been "traitors to their class." This is to misunderstand both their treason and their class. Muenzenberg's apparatus reached into every country of interest to the Bolsheviks: Germany, France, England, the United States, the Low Countries, the Scandinavian democracies, and many more, and in all those places, it sought to organize the intellectual elite, particularly wherever that elite was in formation, for example in colleges and universities. Precisely the same people who instituted the Cambridge penetrations supervised parallel operations in New York and Washington, in the Ivy League and at the Ecole Normale Superieure in Paris. The obvious yet rarely understood bond between the so-called 'establishment' and what Lionel Trilling called the 'adversary culture'—that part of society which, by virtue of its superior education and critical equipment, develops for itself a leveraged position within the middle class, based in ambiguity and the perspectives of criticism and argument . . . The radical solution [the adversary culture] would tear aside the bourgeois facade. The recruitment of the Cambridge spies and similar agents in the democracies was based on this simple insight: The adversary culture is an elite. This is what a prime manipulator of the Cambridge group, Theodore Maly, one of the greatest of the 'great illegals', the Hungarian mafioso, understood and created as a network . . . The youth can be best discerned in the quality of their protest. Catch that protest in its school days. Develop it properly. Deepen it, convince it, frighten it, blackmail it, network it. Then you will have forged the unseen 'revolutionary' bond between Bohemia and power.

Then, indeed, what American education and culture has become today will be achieved. When the Institute, the Comintern, and the Cheka moved in on the British elite, on Cambridge and Bloomsbury and the proper areas of London, it was treading on fertile ground. Lytton Strachey had set out to completely change the character of the British elite, even as a student at Cambridge, and to organize his collegiate contemporaries into a force dedicated to destroying Western culture and civilization, though not precisely in the terms of the 1843 Karl Marx. Those contemporaries were the sons and daughters of the British ruling class and from them came the Bloomsbury coterie, an intellectual mafia from which the Comintern recruited both the Cambridge spies and the "agents of influence." But far more important, through the subversion of Western *mores*, were the neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian cultural dynamiters, the *Sonnenkinder*, who took their cue from the Frankfurt School.

The "Cult of Friendship"

It is of some significance that Strachey's "cult of friendship" was in fact homosexual. He believed that as a homosexual he belonged to an erotic elite that had passed beyond the crudity and grossness of heterosexual manhood into realms of finer feeling, even though he recognized Cambridge's "sad atmosphere of paradox and pederasty." But he added in a letter to John Maynard Keynes, "We must tell the whole truth and the whole truth is the Devil . . . . It is madness to dream of making dowagers understand that feelings are good, when we say in the same breath that the best ones are sodomitical."

The political mentors of the Bloomsbury coterie were the Fabians, led by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, the new cultural mandarins in British publishing, broadcasting, and academia. But the sun that shone on their children was a harsh one. Critical writings on the coterie describes them as unrestrainedly vicious among themselves and cruel to a sado-masochistic degree to those not anointed. They would have subscribed to what the novelist E.M. Forster would argue in defense of their treason, that loyalty to a friend was superior to loyalty to one's country, even if he was collaborating in the destruction of that country and of millions. They had other principles on their mind. When Guy Burgess, a jump

ahead of Scotland Yard, departed for the Soviet Union, Auden remarked that this was a slap to England analogous to his own departure for safety in the United States. And Graham Greene, who served under Philby in British Intelligence, said in his friend's defense, "Who has not committed treason to something or someone more important than country." In Bloomsbury, that was a difficult question to answer.

Looking back in the 1950s to that period in Britain's moral decline, Rebecca West would write in *The New Meaning of Treason* that many English people "would have felt more at ease with many of the traitors" in her book. They would have "felt that patriotic heroism has something dowdy about it, while treason has a certain style [and] sophistication"—*panache*, one might say. With Muenzenberg's powerful Left Book Club bestowing publication only on far-left writers and intellectuals, the inducements were more than style. "They would have felt that subtlety was all on the side of the traitors," and that it was all "a matter of taste," as Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov said of fascism after the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact.

The role of homosexuality, with no relation to its morality, is of significance because it was employed both as a lure and as a tool for blackmail by Anthony Blunt when he used the Apostles, formally the Cambridge Conversation Club, a traditional campus secret society for aristocratic intellectuals. to recruit for the espionage apparat which he led, and which would include Kim Philby, Guy Burgess, and Donald Maclean. The other factor that aided the Cambridge spies among the Apostles was the appeal of elitism based on contempt for the Establishment, for the working class, and for all those who were not associated with their society. Just the lifted eyebrow of disapprobation was a powerful weapon. Blunt's total snobbery was fed by his association with the Rothschilds and with others in the social and political life of England, and with the highest levels of the Intelligence community.

The Institute had long since made its approach through Richard Sorge — *Dr.* Sorge, the Institute and other title-happy Germans liked to remind the world — to moles like "Dickie" Ellis of the top echelon of MI-6. Its backdoor entrance into the Apostles was seemingly based on intellectual snobbism and neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian coloration. But to the secret group this was one

more link to the Comintern. And that link created vulnerability in Britain's Intelligence services. After Versailles, MI-5 and MI-6 were more at war with each other than with any potential enemy of their country. The Apostles even hobnobbed with the Intelligence services in revelry at Lord Rothschild's[12] Bentinck Street mansion, where working-class boys strip-teased and shared drugs, participating in sodomitical orgies. The diplomatic corps was also given to such "eccentric" practices as transvestitism.

The Frankfurt School had more formal arrangements with the Fabian Society whose research department had been founded by H.G. Wells and was until 1918 headed by George Bernard Shaw. Beatrice Webb was passionately Stalinist, and she as passionately accepted the Institute doctrine that the existing social structure must be burned to the ground. Though people's lifestyles were better than they had ever been before, the Fabians preached the anti-Panglossian message that they lived in the worst of all possible worlds. If told of atrocities in the USSR, they argued imperiously that conditions were even worse in Europe and America. and that it was naive to believe that Britain was better, or even as good, as the worker's paradise.[13]

The Institute's subterranean ties with the Apostles may have been more productive for Willi Muenzenberg, but those with the London School of Economics were overtly more substantial and potentially more profitable. Harold Laski was the *eminence rouge* of the London School and he had considerable muscle on the Left. Though he occasionally fulminated against the Communists—their job, he wrote in a 1940s pamphlet was the "organization of catastrophe"—his real quarrel with them was that they listened to the Politburo in Moscow instead of to him. The London School had at its head Lord Beveridge, later to outline Britain's cradle-to-the-grave welfare state, who wielded both power and influence in the governmental Establishment. He would come to the Institute's rescue in the early 1930s when the rise of Hitler had required the transfer from Frankfurt of Institute facilities, though Kim Philby was more successful when he planted the Frankfurt School at the Geneva headquarters of the League of Nations' International Labor Organization, then a center for Soviet espionage and propaganda.

The Institute's outreach to the Cambridge *apparat,* to Beatrice

Webb and the Fabians, and to the London School of Economics, was not marked by dialectical stasis in Frankfurt. Horkheimer, Marcuse, and Adorno were doing academic legerdemain on notions of "positive freedom," "negative freedom," and their "Hegelian opposition and synthesis." Freedom, Erich Fromm was asserting, meant *freedom to* as well as *freedom from*. And to this hardly new or original formulation, Marcuse was adding Critical Theory's slant: "We know that *freedom is an eminently political concept*. Real freedom for individual existence (and not merely in its liberalist sense) is possible only in a specifically structured *polis*, a 'rationally' organized society." This Orwellian concept edged towards the thinking of those who insisted that freedom can only be structured in a prison. The Institute was also moving towards its later work in America on authority and the "authoritarian personality."

Setting history on its ear, the Institute held that as monopoly capitalism advanced, political and legal institutions became totalitarian. On this, Marcuse would write for the Institute's *Zeitschrift*, "The turn from the liberalist to the total-authoritarian state occurs within the framework of a single social order. We can say it is liberalism that 'produces' the total-authoritarian state out of its own consummation at a more advanced stage of development." This was written at a time when the Soviet Union had totally abolished freedom and had moved into the most totalitarian system the world had then known.

The Institute embarked on its first "psychoanalytical" poll, in which the answers were taking down verbatim and then analyzed to allegedly determine whether they reflected the true feelings of those questioned. To no one's surprise, "the interviews [of seven hundred working-class respondents]" as Martin Jay reports, "disclosed a wide discrepancy between avowed beliefs and personality traits." Having psychoanalyzed the responses to questions on the education of children, industry, the possibility of a new war, and the locus of real power in the state, Erich Fromm and his Institute associates decided that 10 percent exhibited an "authoritarian" character — "authoritarian" not explained—15 percent were "anti-authoritarian" susceptible to Left persuasion, and the balance were "ambivalent" leading the Institute to conclude that they would not rise up in revolt against a "right-wing" seizure of power.[14] Horkheimer had the good sense never to publish the

findings of this "poll," leading to arguments and backbiting by Fromm.

Time in Germany, however, was running out for the Institute. Though the Kremlin and the KPD, the German Communist Party, still held that by toppling the Weimar republic they would stop Hitler, Horkheimer was not so sure and neither were those of his associates who like himself would be classified as Jews, however anti-Semitic their passions, if the Nazis took over. Some two years before President Hindenburg capitulated to Adolf Hitler and handed him the reins of power, the Institute decided to weigh anchor. Horkeimer, a very rich man, who brushed aside the wealth of nations but not his own, transferred his considerable assets and those of the Institute to Geneva and set up, whether temporarily or permanently it could not be predicted, in the League of Nation's International Labor Organization building. The ILO, presumably working in the interests of labor, had become the headquarters for Soviet underground activities, and MI-6's Kim Philby, already in full mole uniform, made the arrangements. For a time, the plan was to open branches of the Institute in Paris and London — and to replace Muenzenberg, in effect the Institute's "case officer," then under increasing suspicion of being too anti-fascist, with Otto Katz, who had been slotted by the Soviet secret police to be Willi's watchful assistant. Reference has already been made of Katz's activities, but since he became the Comintern-Soviet secret police watchdog of the Frankfurt School, he merits a fuller summary of his life and operations

Otto Katz

He was a Sudeten German born in Prague who had emigrated to the fleshpots of Berlin, founded a small literary magazine. He was "discovered" at age 24 by Muenzenberg whose top assistant he eventually became. His early work was as liaison with the Frankfurt School. His friendship with Bertold Brecht lasted into their Hollywood period, when Katz would deliver to Brecht his Comintern "stipend." Both shared the view, frequently expressed by Brecht, that the victims of the Great Purges in the Soviet Union should have been executed "even if they were innocent."

Katz operated under his own name, and under the aliases of André Simone and Ludwig Breda. As manager of Erwin Pisca-

tor's Total Theater, he was caught with his hand in the till to the tune of 100,000 marks, but Muezenberg came to the rescue, spiriting him to Moscow where he was enrolled in the Lenin School for training in espionage, underground operations, and what the Soviets called "wet work," political murder. In England, to prepare for what was thought to be the transfer of the Frankfurt School, he continued the cooperation begun by Sorge with moles in MI-6. When the Frankfurt School set up a temporary branch in Paris, Katz gave it the use of one of the buildings from which the Comintern operated. With the Frankfurt School's move to New York and Columbia University, it became a kind of *pied á terre* for Katz in his Broadway and Hollywood operation.

Under the name of Ludwig Breda, he made the Hollywood Anti-Fascist League one of the most successful money-raising Communist fronts in the U.S. He also organized clandestine Party activities, establishing Brecht, Weill, Hanns Eisler, and the Group Theater cell in filmdom. The aim then was not to influence the content of films, but to make Hollywood a super employment agency which would give jobs to Party members, to discourage anti-Communists, and to milk the "cash cow."

During the Spanish Civil War, Otto Katz's job: to track down anti-fascist fighters who were on Stalin's purge list. In Mexico, he was involved in the assassination of Leon Trotsky. In Cuba, he helped organize the assassination of Tina Modotti. At the time of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, "André Simone" was back in the States, working with other agents to sabotage aid to Britain. He was arrested and deported as a Soviet and Nazi agent, but returned illegally. In 1947, he was in Prague to help Noel Field, the former State Department mole, in preparing the great Czech show trials, but instead found himself in the dock, pleading for the death penalty, which the Czech People's Republic graciously granted him.

For the Institute for Social Research, these were difficult times. Horkheimer wished to leave Switzerland, arguing that there Marxist Jews would not be safe. His more important reason was that Geneva was really not in the academic loop. He wanted to move to London, and his assistant director, Freidrich Pollock was dispatched to England. His mission: To negotiate with Lord Beveridge for the virtual incorporation of the Frankfurt School into the London School of Economics, of which he was Director. The

Institute's 60,000-volume library was still in Frankfurt, impounded by the Nazis, and this ownership would be transferred to the London School, which might succeed in persuading the German Foreign Office to release it. London would have put the Institute in the center of Britain's academia, perfect for a Comintern organization whose "official" financial resources were down to $30,000 a year. Lord Beveridge agreed, without consulting his colleagues, causing a real tohu-bohu. Harold Laski was of course delighted at the thought of adding to the neo-Marxist weight of the London School of Economics.

University Professor Lionel Robbins had a different view. "I had strolled into the Director's room for a talk about some minor departmental matter when he informed me with great satisfaction that he had virtually completed an agreement with a certain research organization whereby, in return for the deposit with us of its valuable library, it would be given accommodations at the [London] School and authority to use it as its headquarters," he recalls. Horrified, Robbins protested that the Frankfurt School was "well known as a stronghold of Marxism in Germany." Incorporation "might involve the introduction of something quite alien to the principles on which the [London] School had been founded, and it certainly ran the danger of appearing to confirm all the ignorant misrepresentations to which we were always subject."

Frederick Hayek's reaction, recalled by him years later, and quoted by author Ralf Darendorf, was far more explosive: "The London School of Economics would have become a Communist institution in effect. Some of [the Frankfurt people] are dreadful creatures. It's the kind of Marxism I dislike the most. It's a combination of Marxism and Freudianism. I am equally opposed to both of the sources, and its combined form I find particularly repulsive." This from the economist whose book, *The Road to Serfdom*, brought him international fame and importance. There is no record as to what Hayek said at the time. Lord Beveridge, however, persisted—at least on the project to rescue the Institute's library, even to calling for a lawsuit against the Nazi government, but wiser heads prevailed, pointing out that such a suit before a Nazi court would be ridiculously futile—and only Dr. Pollock continued to press for it.

But while the assistant director was attempting to twist the

arms of those at the London School who were merely aware of the Institute's overt record, Max Horkheimer was reaching out to the infinitely better-funded Rockefeller Foundation to move him to the United States. As Martin Jay ironically notes in his sympathetic history of the Frankfurt School, "The Institute's members may have been relentless in their hostility towards the capitalist system, but they never abandoned the life-style of the haute bourgeoisie." Jay described Horkheimer as a "great schemer"—and in that capacity he had enlisted the efforts of John Dewey, Robert MacIver (head of Columbia University's sociology department), and crypto-communist Robert Lynd to find the Frankfurt School a billet at Columbia University.

The president of Columbia University was Nicholas Murray Butler. He had built Columbia into one of the great American universities, solid academically and conservative in its application of the Liberal Arts. Butler himself was considered falsely as being a black reactionary by the Young Communist League and its followers on the campus as the Depression deepened,[15] and even the basically conservative Southern students succumbed to this feeling. With the ascendancy of the New Deal, Butler was seeking to change his image. Professors MacIver and Lynd, already connected to the Institute in its Geneva exile, and onetime Frankfurt School "visitor," Professor Dewey, highly regarded by Butler, used moral suasion—or was it academic pressure—though never informing him of the nature and ideology of the Institute, which they all knew and approved. Learning that the Rockefeller Foundation would finance the move from Switzerland, Butler agreed to embrace the Frankfurt School as an integral part of Columbia, even to giving them a building on the campus, on West 117th Street.[16]

That generous gesture drove the first nail into the coffin of American education, the American way of life, and its Judeo-Christian principles. Horkheimer, Fromm, Marcuse, Wittfogel, *et alia*, came to New York, received a hero's welcome, and with John Dewey's approval, proceeded to take over Columbia's Teacher's College, the nation's foremost institution in generating educational theory, which regularly sent out its graduates as a teaching *aristoi* to the rest of America's teaching schools. And for Iagniappe, there was Columbia's New College, experimenting in pedagogy, which did not trifle with such bourgeois trappings as marks, attendance,

or examinations—substituting for John Dewey's "learn by doing" a deeper concept, "learn by massaging the ego."

The Institute, now the International Institute, brought with it the trinity of Otto Katz a.k.a. Ludwig Breda a.k.a. André Simone. Willi Muenzenberg might have said: "Of such is the Kingdom of Lenin."

★ ★ ★

[8]

The International Institute—Old Mission, New Target

In its Weimar incarnation, the Institute for Social Research preached an amalgam of the "new" Marxism and the "new" Freudianism as the panacea for all of Germany's ills—and perhaps the world's as well. This was stated in large print on the package. Nowhere was it said that the end of its aims, hopes, and plans was not written in *Das Kapital* or the *Interpretation of Dreams* but in the 1843-44 writings of Karl Marx and the distortion of Freud. The still young and not yet painfully carbuncular Karl had offered then a vision of a world in which in which all traces of Western civilization and Western culture were wiped out in a political and economic holocaust on which the Marxist survivors would build Utopia The slogan could have been, "Intellectuals of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your brains." But the Critical Theorists—which is what the neo-Marxists cum neo-Freudians now called themselves—had, in fact tossed out the class struggle and its dreams for the "proletariat"—*lumpen* or otherwise—for a war by the eggheads against humanity.

As of the early 1930s, all that the Frankfurt School, the KPD, and the Comintern had achieved was creation of the conditions for the victory of the National Socialist Party. In the war against the Weimar Republic, the Frankfurt School, along with the German Left, had seen Nazism as the final phase of monopoly capitalism,

which everybody knew was doomed, along with religion and Western civilization. Ironically, the Western powers also saw Nazism as a kind of extreme capitalism, and therefore believed that they could, by appeasement and bribery, join it in a war against the Soviet Union. That both Germany and the Soviet Union sustained each other, from the days of Versailles, through the Hitler-Stalin Pact, and until a Nazi invasion opposed by both the German military and German industrialists, somehow escaped the understanding of Britain, France, and the United States.

When the International Institute for Social Research moved into its own building on West 117th Street on the Columbia University campus, the Reichstag fire and the roar of burning books had made clear the revolutionary nature of the Nazi regime. By its gentle treatment of George Thaelman and the other German Communist leaders charged with setting the Reichstag afire—the only harsh sentence was meted out to the half-wit van der Lubbe who presumably applied the match—the Nazi regime made it clear that its anti-Communism and anti-Marxism were basically propaganda tinder. It was the liberals, the conservatives, and the socialists that Hitler despised. The Institute might have remained longer in Frankfurt but for the fact that almost its entire leadership was regarded as Jewish by the Nazis, even though almost to a man they had abhorred their natal religion as they abhorred all religion and all Western culture and *mores*.

The move to Switzerland had been temporary, since Geneva did not afford Max Horkheimer the *mise en scene* he required, or the access to money and influence. In the Weimar days, his critics had accused him of *salonbolschewismuss* (parlor Bolshevism), claiming that he was more wedded to his luxuries than to principle—in short was regarded as the Teutonic version of Park Avenue pink. Paris was out of the question because of the general hostility to the *Boche*. London, too, was out when it became clear to Horkheimer that the British were not ready to provide a munificent upkeep. The United States was something else again, seen as a cow mooing to be milked. The great foundations, a vast pool of corporate funds set up to avoid taxation, were there, ready to pass on their millions and billions to those dedicated to destroying the system that provided this wealth, and run by a managerial class which basically despised the society that was paying its inflated salaries.

Columbia

For starters, the Frankfurt School could count on the Rockefeller Foundation, which lavished its funds on the Left and frowned on the Right.[67] Other great foundations—a major one having been set up by Henry Ford II—were following suit. And with few exceptions, corporate givers to "tax-exempt" groups exhibited their generosity with stockholders' funds. As already reported, John Dewey had pressed hard for bringing the Frankfurt School to Columbia University and President Butler held Dewey in high esteem. As Sidney Hook would politely put it, "There was a strong philosophical kinship between Karl Marx and John Dewey, as Bertrand Russell and others have remarked." Professor Robert MacIver, head of Columbia's sociology department, and Professor Robert Lynd, both already on the board of the Institute, added their academic prestige. And Horkheimer, Fromm & Co. knew that the corporate and academic money was there almost for the taking, if you had the proper sponsorship.

The move to Columbia had been very well planned. The preliminary softening of President Butler, as noted in an earlier chapter, was done by John Dewey. This was followed by a disingenuous letter from Professor MacIver, as head of the sociology department, to "Dear Mr. President:"

> It has come to my notice that a body of scholars, established previously at Frankfurt am Main, is in the process of locating themselves in this country. Their journal, *Zeitschrift fur Socialforschung*, is a recognized and valuable medium of studies in the social sciences. They are anxious to receive some recognition from an American university. They have had offers, I understand, from the University of Chicago and also from Princeton, but they would welcome, more than anything else, a connection with Columbia .... [N]o doubt, various questions should be looked into before definite steps are taken in that direction. But I would suggest that in the meantime a very good purpose would be served, and the beginnings of a closer relationship established, if this body of scholars were offered housing facilities by Columbia.

With what has been characterized as "speed and generosity," Butler agreed to immediate affiliation. Horkheimer was suspi-

cious and fearful that a "liberal conservative" like Butler might change his mind once he had learned of the Marxist-Freudian nature of the Institute. He was reassured that a selection of Frankfurt School publications, including some issues of the *Zeitschrift*—all in German, and carefully chosen for their absence of Marxist jargon and provocative terminology, had been quickly thumbed through by University personnel. Lynd, however was asked directly by the Secretary of the University for a written guarantee that if the Institute was assigned teaching duties and faculty status, it would remain within the University's intellectual and ideological purview and not carry out propaganda activities. His response, too was a model of disingenuousness:

> The only possible entanglement in this whole affair lies in the fact that the Institute is on the liberal-radical side. I have called this to MacIver's attention, and think he is pretty well aware of it. From what little I have seen of their work, and from my conversations with [Julian] Gumpertz, I think it is fair to conclude that they are a research agency with high standards and not interested in propaganda. . . . [T]he whole tenor of the conversation has been in terms of a very loose affiliation with the University, with the possible appointment of one or two members of our Faculty of Political Science to their governing board, and complete autonomy for them.

Both letters were typically Aesopian and carefully false. The Institute had not been offered a haven at Princeton or the University of Chicago. Lynd and MacIver were well aware of the neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian nature of the Institute, since they were on its board of directors. And Lynd, through his Communist affiliations, could only have been privy to the Institute's Comintern connection, though hiding it from the University. There was a tacit understanding that members would be integrated into the University's graduate faculties. The Institute's academic agenda could be obscured. But its mission remained the same. Thus the Marxist-Freudian fox was let loose in the American hen house. The Institute was free to take over unaware individuals and institutions which previously had no Marxist taint.

John Dewey's sponsorship gave the Institute a lock on Teacher's College—the foremost educational institution in the U.S.

The influence of Teacher's College, in fact, reached out across the country, as its graduates filled more than 60 percent of all teaching and educational administrative posts in the country. The College itself worked continually at devising IQ and attitudinal measurements of students, testing them at academically prestigious institutions such as the Fieldston School in Riverdale, New York, as well as public schools nationwide. Not only did it control the experimental New College, but it ran the Lincoln School, adjacent to the University. Expensive "progressive schools" everywhere turned to Teacher's College for guidance. At one such school a parent visiting to determine whether to enroll her children was shocked to see a little girl brandishing a hammer and chasing a fellow pupil. "Aren't you going to do something about that?" the parent asked. "Oh, no," she was told, "they're just expressing themselves"—much as students today express themselves with guns. But John Dewey and Teacher's College had begun to proclaim that to stop such activities would be repressive, just as education itself was authoritarian. Dewey, moreover, turned over to the Institute the National Education Association, which he had headed for some years—encouraging the NEA, today one of the nation's largest, richest, most leftist, and most powerful unions, to go beyond its concerns of wages, hours, and working conditions, to dictating curricula and educational aims according to the Institute's gospel.

At Columbia, the Institute realized that it had to do a little semantic juggling. Where in Germany it had employed the term "revolutionary," this was now translated to "democratic." The titles of some of its more flamboyant publications were bowdlerized to conceal their anti-capitalist content. It softened its anti-religious utterances, clothing them in junk psychology. And the blatant anti-Semitism the Institute preached in Germany was thoroughly erased, to suck in dollars from Jewish organizations deeply troubled by the rise of Hitlerism. The Frankfurt School's move to America made dominant what had been implicit in its German activities. It had been founded originally and ostensibly as an institute to re-think and re-invent "classical" Marxism and rescue it from the outdated economics of *Das Kapital* and the bravura rhetoric of *The Communist Manifesto*. It put aside the class struggle and the romantic glorification of the "proletariat" at a time when

the proletariat was ceasing to exist and much of the working class was moving both politically and economically into a quasi-middle class. Industrialists were learning that it was more profitable to improve labor's economic status than to grind it down—contrary to Marx's theory—if only to create a market for mass-produced goods. The trade unions, which were to man the barricades, had more practical interests, none foreseen by Marxists. In the process Willi Muenzenberg was willing to allow those creating a "Critical Theory" to split hairs, diddle with Hegelianism, and carry on the most abstruse discussions, just so long as they stuck to their basic purpose.

Through Richard Sorge and others, it had cemented ties with the NKVD/GRU in England, as well as with such forces of Stalinist penetration as the Bloomsbury cabal, the Tavistock Institute, and the London School of Economics. It had dabbled in corruption through its followers and adjuncts in Weimar Berlin. The move to America came when the winds of war had begun to shake the political trees. The Comintern did not know exactly where the Soviet Union would stand, but all indications were that its allies would be the Axis powers, its enemies the Western Powers and the United States. So convinced of this was Stalin that when he read the reports by Richard Sorge, Walter Krivitsky, and other espionage agents, that Nazi troops were mobilizing along the Russo-German border, he scrawled across them, "This is a British provocation, and those responsible should be punished."

The America in which the Frankfurt School found itself could no longer be a philosophical front for illegal activities. It could covertly continue its long-range attack on Western mores, but its prime mission was to capture those institutions which motivate the body politic, and the intellectuals who control them: the education establishment, communications, filmdom, radio (and soon TV) and press, foreign policy, brainwashing—with an eye to the time when, as the Kremlin hopefully foresaw it, Germany and the Soviet Union were at war with Britain, France, and the United States. Conducting this softening-up process in the United States was Comintern gauleiter Gerhard Eisler, brother of the Institute's Hanns Eisler, for the Comintern. and Otto Katz for the NKVD. Muenzenberg had fallen under suspicion for his alleged anti-fascism, and it had been Katz's job to spy on him as he was slowly

deprived of all authority and finally "liquidated" in a French forest as he sought to elude Stalin's assassins.

The Frankfurt School's departure to England, France, and the United States had been organized by the Rockefeller-financed Emergency Committee for Displaced German Scholars headed by Egbert R. Murrow (who changed his first name to Edward when he became one of the leading wartime broadcasters). Woefully insecure in English, and snobbishly critical of all things American, which obviously did not measure up to the cabaret standards of Weimar Berlin, the Institute increasingly fell under the influence of the likes of Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, Paul Lazarsfeld, and a Herbert Marcuse who in not too many years would be tearing down campuses, vilifying decency, glorifying violence and pornography, and Nazifying the spelling of "Amerika."

★ ★ ★

[9]

Ipse Dixit, or, Don't Say We Were Not Warned

Surveying the bleak headlines, one wonders if the endless evils chronicled could be mere chance—or if they might have some conscious, common source and deliberate direction . . . . It makes a great deal of difference if we believe that social evils are caused by widespread economic ignorance—or false philosophical ideas—or personal immorality . . . or a band of conspirators. Each theory logically implies a different response . . . . Accepting the wrong theory guarantees that our remedial efforts will fail and that the evils will persist.

—*Robert Bidinotto*

There is a revolution coming. It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will originate . . . with culture, and it will change the political structure only as its final act. It will not require violence to succeed, and it cannot be successfully resisted by violence. It is now spreading with amazing rapidity, and already our laws, institutions, and social structure are changing in consequence.

—*Charles Reich*

Mao — his sword,
Marcuse — his prophet

—*Pravda*

Critical Theory," the umbrella for a whole spectrum of positions associated with the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, has finally, after long delay, an opportunity to become an integral part of English-speaking culture. Comprised of philosophers, literary critics, sociologists, psychologists, economists, and political scientists—of whom Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Erich Fromm, Max Horkheimer, Otto Kirchheimer, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Neuman, and Friedrich Pollock are the major figures—the Frankfurt School came into existence in the mid-1920s as an association of Left intellectuals.

—*Paul Piccone*

One can rightfully speak of a cultural revolution, since the protest is directed against the whole cultural establishment, including the morality of existing society . . . there is one thing we can say with complete assurance. The traditional idea of revolution and the traditional strategy of revolution have ended. These ideas are old-fashioned . . . what we must undertake is a type of diffuse and dispersed disintegration of the system.

—*Herbert Marcuse*

There are three stages of social revolution: (1) Destructive criticism of the existing order, (2) Revolutionary theorizing and agitation, and (3) Revolutionary action . . . . Before the revolutionary onslaught can have any chance of success, the social order must first have been undermined and morally discredited. This is accomplished primarily by the process of destructive criticism.

—*Lothrop Stoddard*

The Revolutionary . . . is the man who has emancipated himself from the ties of blood and soil, from his mother and father, and from the special loyalties to state, class, race, party, or religion . . . . Psychologists must themselves be revolutionary characters.

—*Erich Fromm*

We should consider psychological techniques for changing personality . . . . Techniques for overcoming resistance, developed

mainly in the field of individual psychotherapy, can be improved and adapted for use with groups and even on a mass scale.

—*Theodor Adorno*

Matriarchal theory aroused renewed excitement in several different quarters . . . . In psychoanalytical circles, matriarchal theory was also being given new consideration. Wilhelm Reich was among the first to do so. By 1933, he was able to write in *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* that matriarchy was the only genuine family type of 'natural society'. Fromm was also one of the most active advocates of matriarchal theory.

—*Martin Jay*

Revolutionary sexual politics must do more than just point out the objective basis of the Authoritarian family . . . . Sexually awakened women, affirmed and recognized as such, would mean the complete collapse of the Authoritarian ideology . . . .The truth of the matter is that sexuality changes in the course of the revolution.

—*Wilhelm Reich*

There is an urgent need to transform American education and the American family . . . . The next step in personal evolution is a transcendence of both masculinity and femininity to general humanness.

—*A. H. Maslow*

Americans have a masculine symbol for their collective citizenry. But Uncle Sam . . . is badly in need of a makeover . . . . It is time to invent Auntie Sam. For the country is going through a period of feminization. Political pundits noted the phenomenon at both the major party conventions [in 1966] . . . . The trend was especially apparent among Democrats in Chicago. There, not only were half the delegates woman [mainly from the National Education Association], but the preferred genre was the sob-story. . . . Prime time itself has been undergoing feminization . . . . No historically male institution can resist feminization, including the Citadel Military Academy. . . . One of the basic distinctions in human experience—that between men and women — is in America getting blurrier and blurrier.

—*The Economist*

The nation must be taught to be terrified of itself.

—*Karl Marx*

The revolutionist enters the world of the state and the educated privileged classes and lives in it only for the purpose of its fullest and quickest destruction . . . . For him morality is everything which contributes to the triumph of the revolution. Immoral and criminal is everything that stands in his way . . . . He knows only one science, the science of destruction . . . . The only salutary form of revolution is one which destroys the entire state to the roots and exterminates all traditions, the whole social order, and all existing classes.

—*Nechaev*

In the name of love and the name of freedom, with love as our guide, we'll slit every throat that threatens the people and our children. We'll do it in the name of peace, if that is what we have to do; because as soon as it's over, then we can have the kind of world where violence will no longer exist . . . . We'll change their minds or else in the people's name we'll have to wipe them out thoroughly, absolutely and completely.

—*Huey Newton*

The New Black Panther Party is an instrument in a war against "worldwide white supremacy" . . . . We will either transform this society today, or we will destroy it.

—*Aaron Michaels*

The Weathermen — those people were cold. They were white guys who said all white people deserved to die, including the white children. They said that they should kill white children because if they grow up, they'll be racist just like their mothers and fathers.

—*Aaron Michaels*

In 1982, Professor Bertell Ollman of New York University was pleased to announce that "a Marxist revolution is taking place today in American universities!" Professor Ollman's textbook, *Alienation: The Marxist Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* . . .

was being used in 1982 in a hundred American universities as prescribed reading, and had by then gone through seven printings.

—*Jean-Francois Revel*

Violence, less and less embarrassed by the limits imposed by centuries of lawlessness, is brazenly and victoriously striding across the whole world, unconcerned that its infertility has to be demonstrated and proved many times in history . . . . Dostoevsky's devils . . . . are crawling across the whole world in front of our eyes, infesting countries where they could not have been dreamed of . . . . They are announcing their determination to shake and destroy civilization! And they are succeeding.

—*Alexander Solzenitsyn*

There will be in the next generation or so a pharmacological method of making people love their servitude and producing dictatorship without tears, producing a kind of painless concentration camp for entire societies, so that people will in fact have their liberties taken away from them but will rather enjoy it, because they will be distracted from any desire to rebel—by propaganda, or brainwashing enhanced by pharmacological methods. And this seems the final revolution.

—*Aldous Huxley*

★ ★ ★

[10]

The War on Family, Morality, Education

Karl Marx had set the stages of historical development as "savagery, barbarism, feudalism, and capitalism," culminating in socialism and eventually the withering away of the state under communism. But the determinism of history proved not to be as deterministic as Marx had predicted. The evils in capitalism which would bring it tumbling down into the lap of Marxist victory—what the historical determinists had predicted since 1844—did not come about. The capitalist industrial revolution resulted in the liberation of industrial workers from the drudgery and toil of hand labor. The standard of living for the "working class" rose so dramatically that by the mid-20th century, the economic status of the "poor" in the United States matched or was superior to that of the middle class of other industrialized nations. In the Soviet Union and other "socialist" societies, the workers had been forced to trade freedom for bread and lost both—with only the elites, the *nomenklatura,* enjoying a life-style never compared to that of the West.

The founders of the Frankfurt School recognized this, and realized that the economic argument, however it might convince the intellectuals and the traditional Marxists—"vulgar" Marxists, the Critical Theorists called them—had almost no acceptance by what was condescendingly called "wage labor." The working class and

the middle class, moreover, had a gut feeling about the economics of a Marxist society and its repeated failures in providing an affluent society. Recall that Georg Lukacs, having been instrumental in the collapse of Bela Kun's Hungarian Soviet Revolution, could argue that it had failed because he had not slaughtered more people. But very much aware at the time he was organizing the Institute for Social Research. he told Karl Radek, Willi Muenzenberg, and Felix Djerzhinski that economic Marxism could not be sold to the world, that the class struggle had been reduced to propagandistic arm-wrestling, and that a new way would have to be found to bring down capitalism. The strategy, as this account has pointed out, was to substitute for class economic warfare the assault by the intellectuals on Western culture and civilization. From this would come a society, as outlined by Aldous Huxley and others, in which at least sixty percent of the people would be drones, well-fed and existing in a miasma of unrestrained sex. The destruction of the West, from which phoenix-like a Marxist utopia would arise, was to be achieved by the combination of neo-Marxism, neo-Freudianism, Pavlovian psychology and mass brainwashing, wrapped up in what euphemistically became known as Critical Theory.

The Weimar Republic was to be the initial focus of Critical Theory. But the Frankfurt School and its Comintern masters miscalculated profoundly when they assessed National Socialism to be the last phase of monopoly capitalism, instead of the kin of Soviet communism. "Judy O'Grady and the Colonel's lady are sisters under the skin," Kipling wrote, and in many ways this applied to post-Weimar Germany and the U.S.S.R. The KPD and the Nazi party had worked hand-in-hand to bring down Weimar, and the Frankfurt School's efforts at total corruption in Berlin had accelerated the process. The New World, frivolous and endlessly self-indulgent, was to be the new theater of operations.

At the time that the Frankfurt School and the Critical Theorists were settling into their new quarters on the Columbia campus, Joseph Stalin was slowly reorganizing the Comintern to put it operationally in complete control by the secret police. This was, in the case of the Institute, to order Otto Katz, Muenzenberg's principal assistant, to spy on his superior and to plan for his "liquidation "(after which Katz would take over Muenzenberg's duties and authority). In its Frankfurt period, the Institute had coop-

erated with the Comintern, contributing to Berlin's cultural and morale debasement. In New York, it not only had its regular assigned mission, but it was also part of a concert of secret groups and activities which ranged from the theater, to Hollywood, to the press, to radio/TV, and to electronic communication. It reached out to the great foundations, particularly the Rockefeller, and also to academic entities like Princeton's School for Advanced Studies, headed by J. Robert Oppenheimer, already snared by the Communist underground, who as revealed by KGB records after the fall of the Kremlin was an active participant in Soviet atomic espionage at Los Alamos, and was carefully protected in the Venona intercepts as "Veksel."

Wilhelm Reich

Critical Theory attacked the family, religion, education, and morality in no particular order. But the first onslaughts on the family, as a sustaining unit of society, were through sexual morality, sex education, and radical feminism. The Institute's point man in this was one Wilhelm Reich who had been among the legion of "displaced scholars"—almost all Marxists of various types—brought to America by Edward R. Murrow. Reich would eventually be expelled both from psychiatric associations and the Frankfurt School, ending his days in madness and prison. But before this, he had launched a campaign whose effects on generations of Americans would be incalculable in tearing the social fabric and deconstructing the nuclear family and education.

The Reichian philosophy of sex ascribed to it the force which would rescue society from the repressiveness of moral codes which frowned on promiscuity, adultery, lesbianism, pedophilia, juvenile fornication, and male homosexuality. Since these prohibitions stemmed partly from religion, they were doubly evil to Reich and to the Frankfurt School. Heterosexual sex was socially productive, and also paid homage to family values, and this too inspired the Reichian opposition. Betty Friedan drew her precepts of sex, matriarchy and the debasement of the male and of the family directly from the Institute—and this is discussed at length later in this account.

Reich's personal history is significant. Born of well-to-do Jewish-anti-Jewish parents in Galicia, the easternmost end of Austria-

Hungary, he grew up in luxury. At age 11, he began having intercourse with the household maids. When he discovered that his tutor was having an affair with his mother, he debated his course of action. In an article for a psychiatric publication written years later, Reich disclosed that he was tempted to use this knowledge to blackmail his mother into having intercourse with him, but he decided instead to inform his father. His mother committed suicide, an outcome which Wilhelm blamed on the world's perverted morality. After service in the Austrian army during the Great War, he entered medical school, where he discovered Freud, writing in 1919 that he had "become convinced that sexuality is the center around which revolves the whole of social life as well as the inner life of the individual."

In Vienna, where he associated with those heroes of the Frankfurt School, Arnold Schoenberg and the Bauhaus's Walter Gropius, he achieved some prominence in the psychoanalytical movement, and subsequently joined the neo-Freudians who were associated with the Frankfurt School. The theory most touted held that sexual repression was linked to political suppression. Monogamy was repressive and led to neurosis and psychosis. Hence, Reich urged, infidelity should not only be tolerated but made mandatory. In an article for the journal *Culture Wars* on Reich and his influence on feminism, it was averred that "psychic blockage based on the mystical inhibition of healthy orgasm was, in fact [as Reich preached], the universal condition of mankind, and as such it could only be combated on a political level" and not, as psychoanalysis was attempting, on a personal level. Hence the marriage of neo-Marxism and neo-Freudianism—the only marriage Reich and the Frankfurt School approved of.

Somewhere along the line, Reich had become fixated on masturbation, more convenient than exploiting parlor maids, not as a substitute for normal sex but as an end in itself. "Children who pray do not masturbate," he wrote. "Children who masturbate do not pray." Masturbation, therefore, served a double purpose—sexual and anti-religious. But masturbation was not conceived simply as sex expression. Along with lesbianism, it became a part of the feminist mystique. to be encouraged and up-graded. Also along with it, the feminists, influenced by the teachings of Kurt Lewin and other neo-Freudian-neo-Marxists, promoted pornog-

raphy, creating a multi-million-dollar industry for pornographic video tapes, vibrators, and other sex toys. They taught that pornography led to the "emancipation" of women who no longer had to participate with males for sexual gratification, and that masturbation was a concomitant of feminism. Enter "cyber sex." As one woman disciple of Reichian philosophy wrote of pornography, it "uproots traditional female roles of passivity, creates emotional confusions, stimulates introspection, and presents a world without the nuclear family. . . . . It represents sex as Revolution." "And vibrators," another Reichian and feminist woman author wrote, "makes female orgasm as quick, easily reproducible, and simple as any male orgasm, ever. They are machines of revolution." Neo-Marxist revolution, that is. In advocating Wilhelm Reich's *Sexual Revolution*—the title of his *magnum opus*—it made sex education of children, pre-puberty boys and girls, and early adolescents a *sine qua non*. The justification for sex education was that it would teach girls the "facts of life" and prepare them to repel the advances of predatory males, young and old. Young males, too, would understand the changes in them, and this would teach them sexual restraint. Ignorance led to the seduction of innocent girls and the pregnancies which made pariahs of them or blighted their lives.

The argument was a selling one, but totally and deliberately false, as taught first in "progressive schools" of a Deweyan persuasion—and later almost universally in the public schools. In the past, parents and teachers had been instructed to answer the questions of children, but to go no further than those questions until further questions were asked. But according to the Reichian sex curriculum, as the Institute took over Teachers College and the NEA, children were instructed and encouraged in the practice of the mechanics of sex, "Well, kids, you're going to be doing it anyway, and that's natural and normal. There's nothing wrong in it, so this is how, and here's a condom so you don't get in trouble." At the same time, there was active indoctrination on the virtues and normality of lesbianism and male homosexuality. with textbooks justifying it.

But precisely what has "sex education" consisted of? In one school, plastic models of female genitalia were passed around to ten-year-old boys. In other schools. 11-year-olds were shown

movies of three actual births, with some children fainting at the sight. Other movies, Professor Thomas Sowell reports, "have shown a man's genitals, a naked couple having sex 'in living color' and complete with sound effects . . . . A so-called 'health' class in a junior high school required all the boys to say 'vagina' in class and the girls to say 'penis'. . . . When one embarrassed girl was barely able to say it, the teacher made her get up in front of the class and very loudly say it ten times."

The U.S. Department of Education, which used taxpayers' dollars to finance this and other educational "reforms," joined the game by issuing a questionnaire for "health education" which asked students: "How often do you normally masturbate (play with yourself sexually)? How often do you normally engage in light petting (playing with a girl's breast)? How often do you normally engage in heavy petting (playing with a girl's vagina)?" Students are also asked to discuss their parents' sex life, and this was used to claim that parents' objections to sex education were the result of their psychological problems.

And the result? Dr. Sowell notes:

> What was the situation before massive, federally-funded "sex education" programs began and how has it changed since? Teenage pregnancy was *declining*, over a period of more than a dozen years, before so-called "sex education" programs spread rapidly through American schools . . . . Teenage pregnancies then rose sharply, along with federal expenditures on "sex education" programs and "family planning" clinics, many located in schools. The pregnancy rate among 15 to 19 year old females [increased by 50 percent] . . . . Abortions among pregnant teenagers more than doubled . . . . Moreover, sex education "experts" were wrong in fundamental ways: (1) in their insistence that abstinence was not a viable option among today's teenagers because "everybody" was having sex and (2) their depiction of the role of parents and traditional values as ineffective or counter productive.
>
> There is no evidence that a majority of teenagers were engaging in sex. As late as 1976, a majority of high school students were still virgins . . . .Even among the so-called "sexually active" 14 percent had been "active" only once in their lives, and half had not engaged in sex in the month preceding their interview.

> Empirical evidence also shows that parents with traditional values have had much more impact than the "experts" have assumed. More than 80 percent of adolescent girls whose parents did not permit dating in their early teens were virgins, compared to only about half who began dating at age thirteen. When Utah passed a law requiring parental consent for minors to be given contraceptives, not only did . . . . teenage abortions decline; so did pregnancy and birthrates. In short, parental influence proved to be a more effective force against teenage pregnancy than so-called "sex education" or even contraceptive clinics. But, over the past generation, traditions that worked have been replaced by "innovations" that sounded good.

Or that furthered the ends of the Critical Theorists. But "sex education" was not the sole goal of the Reichians and the Institute. To it was added "death education" in which nine- and ten-year-olds were taken to morgues and made to touch the bodies of the dead, then questioned about their belief in life after death, in the religious concepts of their parents, and their feelings about death—all to desensitize them, as scenes of actual sex were planned to do. But to Reich's sexual ideology, Adorno and the Critical Theorists added a new wrinkle—the feminization of little boys and the masculinization of little girls. This was pressed in later years by the radical feminists who urged the practice of teaching boys to play with dolls and learn such skills as sewing, while girls were taught and encouraged to climb trees, learn to fist-fight, and become, in effect, super-tomboys. This was conceived as the first step to a matriarchal society and the doom of patriarchal "tyranny."

There was, of course, much more to it, to be further discussed. R. V. Raehn, in his analytical paper *The Roots of Affective Education in American Schools*, pointed out: "The ideas expressed by Wilhelm Reich in his *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* served as an example of the themes that have been injected into American education [by the Frankfurt School]. He asserted that organized religious mysticism in the form of Christian 'mythology' caused a mystical contagion, and a mystical upbringing became the foundation of fascism. He expressed the intent in his works 'to determine the patriarchal power in and outside of man, a power that had been accumulating over thousands of years and finally celebrated its most bloody triumph in the fascist ideology.' He blamed the 'au-

thoritarian family' for patriarchal sexual morality, the paternal suppression of children, and for being the core of politics. As a contrast, he wrote of the 'affirmation of adolescent genital sexuality', the elimination of sexual repression and dissolving the infantile ties to the parents."

The Critical Theorist blueprint for education went far beyond the desensitizing aspects of "sex" and "death" education. Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, Marcuse & Co. had a grand design which would castrate men and testiculate women, creating a brainwashed society both effete and androgynous, in which all the civilized and productive drives of the citizenry would be eradicated and what Aldous Huxley admiringly called "a painless concentration camp" would replace the free social, cultural, political, and economic interplay of individuals. That grand design was not being etched on a *tabula rasa*, for the groundwork had been laid by John Dewey who, first at the University of Chicago and then at Columbia, had established himself as the guru of American educationism and the father of the "progressive school." His theme of "learn by doing" fitted in perfectly with the Reichian precepts of teaching ten-year-olds all there was to know about the theory and practice of sex, both normal and abnormal. At that age, children were to be thoroughly versed in the ithyphallic and, it was hoped, roistering in it—and condom's were supplied to facilitate a quick entry into mature sexual practice.

It is a touchy and perhaps dangerous subject to probe John Dewey's record and his core beliefs. At Columbia, he had the nondiscerning support of Nicholas Murray Butler and the adulation of the social psychologists and anthropologists—Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead, to name but a few. So great was the adulation of Dewey that few bothered to investigate his basic political philosophy. Yet he was from the start an adept at a polite Marxism. His association with the *New Republic*, a publication which under the sainted Herbert Croly preached a liberal-daubed crypto-socialism, is proof enough. But Dewey's roots in academic educationism derived their sustenance from many sources.

Most interesting is Dewey's debt to Anatol Lunacharsky, Lenin's Commissar of Education, who created a system so destructive of the functioning of an industrial state that it was stamped out within years when it became apparent that it was leading to

nihilism and organized ignorance in the USSR.. The products of its educational theory and practice were totally incapable of producing useful citizens and useful workers, for they lacked the basics of reading, writing, and simple arithmetic, and much less the disciplines necessary to move Russia from its Tsarist combination of feudalism and primitive capitalism to a state competitive with the Western European and North American societies. In a series of six articles for *The New Republic*, "Impressions of Russia: A New World in the Making," written after a trip to the Soviet Union reportedly paid for by the Comintern, Dewey enthused over what he would take over as his own.

> It is no accident that Lunacharsky is the Commissar of Education. For while a revival of interest in artistic production, literary, musical, plastic, is characteristic of progressive schools all over the world, there is no country, unless it be possibly [revolutionary] Mexico, where the esthetic aim and quality of education so dominates all things educational as in Russia today. . . . The present age is, of course, everywhere one in which propaganda has assumed the role of a governing power. But nowhere else in the world is employment of it as *a tool of control so constant, consistent and systematic as in Russia at present* . . . . But in Russia, the propaganda is on behalf of a burning public faith. One may believe that the leaders are wholly mistaken in their faith, but their sincerity is beyond question . . . In consequence, *propaganda is education and education is propaganda* . . . When I speak, then, of educational agencies, I mean something much wider than the operation of a school system.
>
> [T]he school cannot count upon the larger education to create in any single and wholehearted way the required collective and cooperative mentality. The traditional customs and institutions of the peasant . . . the influence of home and Church, all work automatically to create in him an individualistic ideology. In spite of the greater inclination of the city worker towards collectivism, even his social environment works adversely in many respects. Hence the great task of the school is to *counteract and transform those domestic and neighborhood tendencies,* that are still so strong, even in a normally collectivistic regime. In order to accomplish this end, the teachers must in the first place know *with great detail and accuracy just what the conditions*

are to which pupils are subject in the home, and thus be able to interpret the habits and acts of the pupil in the school.

The knowledge thus gained of home conditions and their effect on behavior . . . *as preliminary to the development of methods which will enable schools to react upon undesirable conditions discovered* . . . . Apart from the oft-cited Bolshevist modification of marriage and divorce, *the institution of the family is being sapped indirectly rather than by frontal attack;* its historic supports, economic and ecclesiastical are weakened . . . Our special concern here is with the role of the schools in building up forces and factors whose natural effect is to *undermine the importance* and uniqueness of family life. [Emphasis added throughout.]

Bertrand Russell, who shared most of Dewey's views, summed it up in his 1951 book, *The Impact of Science Upon Society*:

> The social psychologists . . . will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at: first, that influences of home are obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten[18]. . . . It is for the scientist to make these maxims precise and discover how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for more than one generation will be able to control its subjects securely without the need of armies of policemen.

And a writer for *The Humanist,* the organ of a movement inspired and openly headed by Dewey—based on the neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian aspects of his philosophy and ideology—put it even more bluntly sometime later:

> I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom . . . . The classroom must and will become an arena between the old and the new—the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of Humanism.[19]

John Dewey and the Frankfurt School could neither shuffle off credit on Lunacharsky or take it entirely for themselves. Lunacharsky had written: that "the development of a child's body, including his nervous system and his brain, is the real object of our work. . . . Man is a machine which can be made to function in such a way as to produce [politically] correct mental phenomena." The Outcome-Based Education and Core Learning Programs which largely took over American public education in the post-World War II era , and which the Frankfurt School, through Teachers College and its infiltration of higher education imposed, was the inspiration for A.S. Neill's *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*. Summerhill was published in the United States in 1960, with a forward by the Frankfurt School's Erich Fromm. By 1970, it had sold two million copies and was used as a required text in six hundred university courses. Lawrence Cremin, the President of Teachers College between 1974 and 1984, and a leading educationist historian, has noted:

> The 1960s were a time of upheaval, innovation, and radical reform at all levels of American education. I have dated the change in climate in educational opinion from the appearance of A. S. Neill's *Summerhill*, and the rather extraordinary response it received in quarters as unlikely [sic] as the *New Yorker* and the academic communities of Cambridge [Harvard] and Berkeley [the University of California] and cited with approval by most education writers at the time.

A.S. Neill

A.S. Neill was a Scottish schoolmaster with a history of mental breakdowns during his military service in the Great War—and a chronic need for psychotherapy. After his discharge from the service, he became a disciple of Homer Lane, an expatriate American who ran a school for delinquents. Lane's Little Commonwealth School operated on the theory that "freedom cannot be given. It is to be taken by the children . . . . Freedom demands the privilege of conscious wrongdoing." When at meal times, the students began throwing food at each other, it was ordered that the staff join them, rather than putting a stop to it. Through Lane, Neill became an associate of the New Education Fellowship (NEF)—and this led to the co-editorship of the NEF's *New Age*, a publication tied to

European Satanism, combined with neo-Marxism, occultism, and the neo-Freudianism of Wilhelm Reich and Otto Gross, described by Sigmund Freud as a "complete lunatic," whose views on sex make Reich's seem almost Victorian.

Neill's career was one of association with all the revolutionary total sex, sex magic, and drug movements of post-World War I. He brought William Steckel—Freud called him "morally insane"—to the attention of English-speaking cultists whose views he seconded in a confused article for the NEF's *New Era*. "Yes," he wrote, "guilt causes neuroses. We must therefore abolish what causes guilt, namely a conscience given from without. Moral education is a sin against the Holy Ghost, for it gives a child a conscience." By 1924, he had established Summerhill School, based on what he called principles of "revolutionary occultism."

Summerhill was one of a trio of schools. The second school was Dartington Hall, founded in 1926 by Dorothy Elmhirst. She was a Standard Oil heiress, first wife of Willard Straight, the J. P. Morgan banker who with her collaboration founded *The New Republic*. Her daughter Beatrice became the wife and comrade-at-arms of Louis Dolivet, a Comintern agent, in time an associate of Willi Muenzenberg and Otto Katz. As a student at Cambridge, her son Michael, for whom the FDR White House doors were always open, became a minor member, as he later admitted, of the Philby-Blount-Maclean-Burgess espionage group. Dartington Hall was briefly closed when parents complained that "black magic" was on its curriculum.

The third School, which according to documentary evidence coordinated its activities with Summerhill and Dartington, was Beacon Hill, the educational game preserve of Bertrand and Dora Russell. Otto Gross was spiritual godfather to all three schools, and Neill participated in their activities. Russell's aim was to make Beacon Hill the training ground for a "didactic apparatus" which would turn out Fabian scientists who would govern the world. But it was not all harmony. In a famous letter to H.G. Wells, Russell complained that Neill, "who is in many ways an admirable man, allows such complete liberty that his students fail to get the necessary training." What he found troubling was that Neill believed that children had to be trained in rebellious freedom and recruited in a war against parents. "There is never a problem

child," he wrote in 1932, "there is only a problem parent." To extirpate religious authority, Neill had his students fake miracles at local churches in order to expose them. When Wilhelm Reich developed his theories of "orgone energy" and began selling telephone-booth size "orgone boxes" to create that "energy," Neill installed these Orgone Energy Accumulators at Summerhill.

The principles of Summerhill education were taken from Deweyan writings and the practices of the early days of the Soviet Union. They were endorsed and encouraged by the Frankfurt School for precisely the reason they were eventually rejected by the Kremlin—because they led to societal disaster—but they were zealously and gleefully exported to the West by the Tavistock Institute, Britain's psychological warfare arm, which had been infiltrated by Kurt Lewin of the Frankfurt School. Neill and Fromm, his Frankfurt School associate, endorsed the process of what we now call the "dumbing down" of education. They eliminated examinations, homework, discipline, and educational content, deliberately pacing teaching to the level of the slowest, to the boredom and failure of the brighter students.

Summerhill advocated "school committees" made up of representatives of faculty and students which would determine curricula. In Soviet and Nazi style, students were ordered to become informers against their parents so that school authorities could discover "subversive home influences" and "authoritarianism." Education ceased to be education, the aim being to employ "psychotherapy" and brain-conditioning drugs to mold students, a practice passed on to American schools, where it is now routine. The Soviet "science" of "pedology" developed techniques which offered "extremely rich pedagogical possibilities at nursery school age" to create a "new pre-school child." Outcome-based education brought a "no fail" system in which learning and study were cast aside as "reactionary" and "authoritarian"—what the Frankfurt School would consider "a basic form of slavery."

One of Dewey's "contributions" to Frankfurt School educational theory came from G. Stanley Hall, his mentor during his Johns Hopkins days. Hall taught that universal literacy was unnecessary and undesirable, arguing that "very many men have lived and died and been great leaders of their age, without any acquaintance with letters." In fact, he asserted, "Illiterates escape

certain temptation such as vacuous and vicious reading. Perhaps we are prone to put too high a value both upon the ability required to attain this art and the discipline involved in doing so, as well as the cultural value that comes to the citizen with his average of only six grades of schooling.[20]

When Stalin turned against the Dewey-espoused Lunacharsky educational theory and practice—that academic teaching was not only unnecessary but "regressive" and "repressive"—it was, in fact, a blow for Neill, Dewey, and the Frankfurt School. They railed mistily against Stalin, thereby mollifying anti-Soviet sentiment. The Tavistock Institute was seemingly cleansed of Bolshevik sin since it was financed by the British monarchy, and it sent its apostles to the major universities and schools of higher learning in the U.S. with the blessings and financing of the U.S. educational bureaucracy. Tavistock centers were opened at such places as the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the Stanford Research Institute's Center for Advance Behavioral Sciences, and the Sloan School at M.I.T. A significant outgrowth of this Tavistockian-Frankfurt School invasion was the establishment of National Training Laboratories whose primary and explicit purpose was the brainwashing of educationists and educationist institutions.

It was the Tavistock Institute that first proposed a deliberately induced and controlled form of neurotic, even psychotic, behavior for the psychological domination of mass society. This would separate the "psychopathological," the "dullards"—"subnormal" individuals who would be recruited mostly from minorities to do the world's heavy labor, and not know any better. The Tavistockian-Frankfurtians began creating an army of "psychological shock troops" (psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, etc.) to set up a society "where it is possible for people of every social group to have treatment when they need it"—according to one of the organization's blueprints "even if they don't wish it, without it being necessary to invoke law."[21]

Under Kurt Lewin, who would later inspire and give ideological structure to the feminist crusade of Betty Friedan and the castrate-the-male brigade which surrounded her, the National Training Laboratories (NTL) developed a technique of "group

dynamics." Under a "group leader," a 'controlled environment" was created in which stress (or "dissonance") is induced to destroy the structure and the *gestalt* of the individual's beliefs. Under pressure, the individual is humbled and "cracked" (Lewin's term) and a new personality subservient to the group leader's emerges. Accepting the changes, the individual denies the degrading process which caused it. The "sensitivity groups" now imposed by statute in today's government, business, and education were established. By January of 2000, the Pentagon was taking military training time to set up "sensitivity" courses so that the troops would have the "correct" attitude towards homosexuals in their midst. Applied to the general population, the following, from a study, "Is Your Child Being Spiritually Molested?":

> From the mid-1950s onward, NTL put the majority of the nation's corporate leadership through such brainwashing programs, while running similar programs for the State Department, the Navy, the Department of Education, and other sections of the Federal bureaucracy. There is no firm estimate of the number of Americans who have been put through this process in the last 40 years at either NTL, or as it is now known the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences . . .or the Western Training Laboratories in Group Development. . . . The most reliable estimate is several millions [with most of these taxpayer dollars coming from an NEA-dominated Department of Education and other Federal agencies].

On the elementary school level, the strategy was to separate the child from his parents and other "subversive" influences, to introduce him at as early an age as possible to adult sexual practices, to remove from his psyche any sense of responsibility for acts against family, school, or friends, (*vide*, the Columbine murders and terror in Littleton) and to build up his "self-esteem" by removing all competitive motivation. A concept of "outcome-based education" was imposed on schools and teachers—a fancy name for denigrating equality of opportunity and substituting equality of performance. The brightest students and the mentally retarded were to emerge from elementary school at the same level of achievement. The difference between right and wrong was to be replaced by the pleasurable. To murder your school friends

was merely to express your personality. The National Education Association approved.

The basics of education, the three Rs, were considered fascistic—though past generations of young people had learned to read and write quickly and efficiently under a system of teaching called "phonics" without donning brown shirts, and the Soviets had employed it to raise literacy standards in the early Red Army. The Frankfurt School educationists were aware of this, but it served their purpose better to mandate a "look-say" system which often induced dyslexia, created reading and emotional problems, and bequeathed to the nation high school and college graduates who were functionally illiterate —the new robots. Students who rebelled against the strait-jacket were to be drugged as if they were autistic, and eventually the use of drugs (Ritilin and Prozac) as a "teaching aid" became general in many schools, with the blessing of the Department of Education, and parents who objected were hounded out of Parent-Teacher associations.

There had been for years a debate among educationists over the merits of phonics (which taught the sound and value of vowels and consonants so that any word could be read) versus "look-say" (which compelled the student to individually memorize each word) and Rudolph Fleisch's book, *Why Johnny Can't Read*, had anatomized the proponents of the latter. The book had been roundly attacked by the Frankfurt School-Teachers College-NEA cabal, but the facts could no longer be ignored after December 1981, when the *Journal of Reading* devoted a special issue to education and literacy in Communist Cuba.

The magazine reported that in the 1970s, Cuban "curriculum experts" had chosen the Phonic-Analytic-Synthetic Method as the best system for teaching reading, a method in use in the USSR, though standard in the past in all U.S. primary education The article noted that children who learn by the "look-say" method, memorizing each of the thousands of words in the English language separately with no syllabic correlation, "do not develop the 'phonematic hearing' which results from the auditory analysis and synthesis of word sounds. Thus, they are hampered in their development of the other language skills of spelling, writing, and speech articulation. To bypass such auditory training is to deprive the child of an important key to language."

And the article went on:

> In the United States, the approach closest to the Phonic-Analytic-Synthetic-Method was developed in the 1930s by Anna Gillingham, an educator [and for many years the psychologist for the Ethical Culture Schools] . . . in collaboration with Samuel Orton, a neurologist interested in dyslexia , the visual scrambling of syllables [a rare disease until the Frankfurt School got at primary education]. Orton decried the use of the "look-say"] method in the schools. . . . A number of methods adapted to classroom use qualify to be termed as the Orton approach . . . What is characteristic of them is [that] they are intensive phonic approaches . . . to words, phrases, sentences and then on to extended discourse. The Orton approach is known to be particularly effective in teaching dyslexic students [who had become reading-disabled in the classrooms of America] because of their great difficulty with the sequence of sounds in words.

All of this was known to educationists and "psychologist-educators" who touted "look-say" and other educational monstrosities— unless it is argued that they were ignorant of the growing critical literature —but they remained silent or continued to block methods which would teach Johnny to read. And since an industrial and a "post-industrial" society must rely on a trained youth, the Frankfurt School embarked on making higher education a farce. The studies which had, ever since the Renaissance, trained young minds in inductive and deductive reasoning, in the history of their culture, and in the lessons of the past, were now systematically cast into the garbage bin and replaced by "African studies" (mostly smoke and mirrors) and other "relevant" subjects like sexual practices on the Upper Nile, along with increased forays into junk science. The "dumbing down" of higher education was not accidental but major part of the plan. In education, it had derived from Georg Lukacs. In politics and culture, Willi Muenzenberg and his successor Otto Katz, with the Frankfurt School taking a deep bow, for it is demonstrable that the "psychologist-educators" knew that "look-say" would cause behavioral dysfunction on a massive scale, and that is precisely why they resisted a return to phonics. Once the functionally illiterate student had been shoveled through secondary school, he was further deprived of an education.

Samuel Blumenfield notes, in *NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education*, that all of this was designed "to convert the entire American public school system into one gigantic behavioral laboratory using American children as their subjects. There is no conspiracy in history to compare to this one." Since conspirators decry "conspiracy theories," those who attempt to focus a light on them find themselves denounced as the real conspirators. But it takes no detective work to trace the history of the NEA from the time in July of 1916, when John Dewey addressed its national convention, issuing a call for the delivery of education in America to the central government, as preparatory to the ideological merger with the Frankfurt School in the mid-1930s.

The NEA, begun as an organization of presidents of teachers colleges, dominated by Columbia University's Teachers College, had included teachers as well. By the end of the Great War, its membership had grown from less than 1,000 to well over 10,000, and it was working hand-in-glove with the New Education Fellowship, an occultist group applying the new "behavioral science" techniques to the transformation of education and introducing cultist elements into the sexualization of primary schools. By the latter part of the Twentieth century, the NEA had become the nation's second largest union, with 2.1 million members, and had a stranglehold on the Democratic Party.[22]

It had also been repeatedly successful in shutting down local schools which failed to meet its demands for higher wages—which at the time made up more than 65 percent of school budgets. In Kalkaska, a Michigan town, the NEA shut down the schools when its demands for three 6 percent raises over three years was refused. The town's average income at the time was $22,000, but average pay for teachers was $32,000. (In some parts of the country, the NEA has hiked teachers' salaries up to $80,000.)

"After the Post Office, schools are the most unionized activity in America," says former Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander. "They collect a lot of money in dues; they are often the largest lobby in the state; they are very, very powerful." For example, in Alabama in 1990 some 40 percent of the legislature were teachers, ex-teachers or teachers' spouses. The NEA's state Secretary-Treasurer, running for governor, exacted $20 per member to finance his unsuccessful election campaign. From its offices, moreover,

campaigns for such junk-science causes as the "nuclear freeze" were run. But the NEA is like no other union. Under the law it is a "Federally chartered corporation" like the American Red Cross, and is therefore exempt from property taxes, and has a semi-official status no other union enjoys. This, though *Forbes* magazine, in an in-depth study, estimates that NEA has an annual income of $750 million, of which $165 million comes from dues, an average of about $400 a year, which are based on a percentage of teacher salaries and not a flat levy, as with other unions. Federal, state, and local education budgets have skyrocketed over the years, yet with every increase (as always incessantly demanded by the NEA), the quality of education has plummeted.

Every measure proposed by real educators or the Congress to improve educational standards has been violently opposed by the NEA. Proposals for merit increases for superior teachers have been met with a furious no-no. Examinations to determine the proficiency of teachers in their own subjects are equally opposed by the NEA.[23] Efforts to eliminate educational practices which are "dumbing down" students (restoration of phonics is but one) are met with hostility and expensive, sometimes vituperative advertising campaigns. In fact, the NEA has gone far beyond the trade-union function of concern over wages and working conditions and now has begun to decide what schools will teach, and how, as well as ideological content.

In 1992, when California voters were presented with a referendum to allow school choice, Ken Geiger, NEA president, expostulated, "We're not going to let the kids escape." In that same year, the NEA-affiliated California Teachers Association worked night and day to bloc citizen petitions to put the question on the ballot. This included the sabotage of efforts to collect signatures at shopping malls, loading the petitions with fake names in order to disqualify them, and comparing the petition drive to one "legalizing child prostitution" and "empowering the Ku Klux Klan." Simultaneously, the NEA has set up a health insurance conglomerate, making deals which raise the cost to members but pour millions into its treasury.[24]

The NEA, dominated ideologically and strategically by the Critical Theorists, was not the only weapon in the Frankfurt School arsenal. In 1933, Dewey and a handful of associates had launched

the Humanist movement. By 1941, this adjunct of the Institute and Teachers College had become the American Humanist Association, and its magazine, *The Humanist,* was in many ways the organ of radical educationism. The manifesto of the movement asserted that Humanists deny God as Creator and accept the evolutionary theory of man's origin as incontrovertible and unchallengeable fact; label traditional religious concepts as inadequate; do not tolerate worship or prayer; strive to control all human institutions; assert that man is entirely a product of his environment; view the free enterprise system as evil; and believe a socialized economic order must be imposed for the common good.

By this time, Dewey was in his 70s and had retired from his full-time responsibilities at Columbia's Teachers College. But he continued to serve as president, and then honorary president, of the NEA. His writings increasingly converged with those of the Frankfurt School, which he had been so largely instrumental in bringing to Columbia and the U.S. In 1936, his essay, "Authority and Resistance to Social Change," argued that freedom and individualism were responsible for the upheavals that triggered dictatorships. Social science, he urged, had developed a means for liberating modern man from freedom and called for "some kind of *collective authority* . . . for a return to some kind of *social control* brought about through, and perpetuated by, *external institutional means*." [Emphasis added.] And until his death, through his continuing influence at Teachers College and the NEA, he gave powerful support to the Frankfurt School and its allies in their drive to transform American culture and American education.

As a postlude: according to the Critical Theory, accepted as gospel by NEA and the Department of Education, a large proportion of children today are "mentally ill," setting the figure at 20 percent, or one in five. "Therapy" must be supplied by prekindergarten and primary schools, in lieu of teaching reading, writing, and elementary mathematics. That mental illness, the Frankfurt School's psycho-scammers assert, is caused by the patriarchal family and its religious precepts. That the major problems in the schools are caused by the children of fatherless families is a fact systematically ignored. The "therapy" which NEA-dominated teachers offer now goes beyond psychiatric gobbledygook. And as has been noted, small children are now being administered

expensive drugs, paid for by the Federal government, to keep them quiet—making life much easier for teachers, particularly those not qualified to teach.

The result? In instance after instance—the Columbine massacre being but one—perpetrators of fatal school violence have been on Prozac (which in some cases induces hostility and belligerence), Ritilin, and other drugs—usually without the knowledge of their parents. In school after school, moreover, parents are discouraged from participating in the educational process since, or so the Critical Theorists argue, they will only pass on their alleged mental illnesses to other children.

★ ★ ★

[11]

Infiltration: New York, Hollywood, OSS

In the small library written about the Frankfurt School and its activities, important questions are seldom asked: Did it just grow by good fortune from a provincial *Institut für Sozialforschung* to the powerful International Institute for Social Research which dominated Teachers College and brainwashed American education and culture? Did its ordinance and function have a sea change when it crossed the Atlantic? Who held the purse strings and the reins? Were there adjuncts propagandistically and organizationally to its work—that is, was the Frankfurt School a collection of eager Germanic professors intent on developing and propagating their political, ontological and ideological theories, or part of a larger operation aimed at softening the glue which held Western civilization together?

The answers do not come trippingly on the tongue, for the Frankfurt School was a complex operation—at times blurting out its message in language so inbred that it required scholarly interpretation, and at other times, like Carl Sandburg's fog, walking on ideological cat feet. Its full aims and purposes were veiled in Machiavellian secrecy and academic double-talk. This, of course, is how it was able to enlist in its legions considerable and powerful numbers innocent of its real nature. But from the start, there were little flashes that betrayed more than academic pushiness.

That the Institute was conceived and planned by Willi Muenzenberg and Georg Lukacs for the Comintern, Felix Djerzihnski for the Cheka, and Karl Radek for the Old Bolsheviks, is a fact which is getting incontrovertible documentary corroboration as Comintern-KGB archives are opened.[25] To re-emphasize: From the Frankfurt School's earliest days, Richard Sorge, drafted already by Soviet Military Intelligence for a career of extraordinary daring-do espionage, was an important participant and doubled as scholar and spy in repeated trips from Frankfurt to Berlin and to London where he dealt with Charles ("Dickie") Ellis, an up-and-coming Soviet mole in MI-6, who would organize OSS for "Wild Bill" Donovan and open its door to Institute talent. It was at the "scholarly" Institute that Sorge recruited Hede Eisler Gumpertz Massing , also involved in the genesis of the Institute, into the world of espionage. It will be recalled as well that Georg Lukacs, the organization's founder, had in his own and Muenzenberg's way been a water-carrier for the Comintern since the fall of the Bela Kun regime in Hungary.

The Frankfurt School was not above recruiting and ideologically manipulating associates in the Weimar era—Kurt Weill, Bertold Brecht, Hanns Eisler—in a merry-go-round on which they shared horses with the novelistic Thomas and Heinrich Mann, Dadaist artists, Britain's Tavistock Institute (U.K.'s equivalent to the Rand Corporation), the Bloomsbury cult, et al. But basically it was not incorporated in what you might call the Comintern table of organization, having an autonomy of a kind. This all changed when, *inter pares* as Columbia University's and Teachers College's brave new cousin, it became inextricably entangled with the growing maze of Communist fronts, transmission belts, theatrical and journalistic ventures, and money-raising labors, as part of Willi Muenzenberg's great coordinated empire—though Willi himself was rewarded for his extravagantly successful efforts by Stalin's kiss of death.

The Institute was, however, only for a time under Muenzenberg's secret direction. Subsequently in charge was the peripatetic Otto Katz, Muenzenberg's second in command, who had been planted in the organization by the NKVD not only to gather evidence against his superior, as this account has already noted, but as part of Stalin's strategy of turning the old Third International

into an adjunct of the secret police—and then camouflaging it as the seemingly meaningless Communist Information Association, the Cominform, during World War II. Katz had been tested in the Berlin of the Weimar era, where he eased the burden of underground work with such of the theater's political round-heels who were impressed by his sophisticated and cosmopolitan manner. In his assigned journeyings in Europe, that manner and his knowledge of languages made him of considerable value. Beneath all that, he had the toughness and brutality to be one of the leaders of the purges of Stalin's foes in Spain during its civil war—and much later involved in the defenestration of Jan Masaryk in Prague.

He made repeated entries into and out of the United States, at one time claiming to be a refugee of the Hitler terror, though he had never set foot in Germany after 1930. His work with the Frankfurt School was one of tight political control and financial involvement, and as liaison with the multitudinous "anti-Nazi" fronts which proliferated in New York and Hollywood. These fronts had grown out of the League Against War & Fascism of the early 1930s (during the Hitler-Stalin Pact period, it changed its name to the League for Peace & Democracy) sponsoring anti-war strikes, in which students walked out of classes, often with their teachers, to pledge that they would refuse to participate in any war—later modified to meet Stalin's needs as any imperialist war, to pro-war, then anti-war during the Pact, and pro-war once more after Hitler betrayed Stalin's trust and invade the Soviet Union.

In Germany the Frankfurt School had lived under the flag of "neo-Marxism" and "neo-Freudianism." But " neo" in those days had a dubious linguistic quality of "not genuine." The label which later became prevalent was "cultural Marxism." The up and coming professorial class liked it better than *Kulturbolschevismus.* Cultural Marxism became the in-thing, supported by legions of fellow-travelers. Let it be it reiterated that the Frankfurt School's major mission in America remained to separate Western man from Western civilization and culture. With males deprived of their *cojones,* and women of their roles as perpetuators of the human race, there would be no obstacle to the new slavery. Academia and mass communications were still the vital targets.

One can gauge the Institute's hold on academia when one recalls the successful drive to defend the Soviet Union as pro-

democratic, anti-fascist (with love and prosperity king), for the preservation of culture, religion, and human values. Some 400 "outstanding" American intellectuals and publicists signed a manifesto so claiming—and attacking as "fascist" those who disagreed. It appeared in *The New Republic*, in which the Frankfurt School had then an almost proprietary interest, on the same day that the Hitler Stalin-Pact was announced. The largest group were professors, all washed in the blood of the Frankfurt lamb, from colleges and universities, mostly from the higher reaches of the academic establishment. Years later, some of those signers would be revealed as having a hand in the Rosenberg-Fuchs-Oppenheimer delivery of the atomic bomb to Russia. The rest, along with many non-signing academics, had already begun indoctrinating students with the precepts of the early Marx and the diseases of neo-Freudianism. After all, was not cultural Marxism "Twentieth Century Americanism?"

Cultural Marxism

The International Institute, courtesy of the golden dome granted by Columbia University and because of its key location in New York City, was able to branch out into "cultural," artistic, and other areas. In New York, and at arm's reach to Hollywood, there was the theater, the dance, art, book publishing, radio (with television to come), and the press, which their sympathizers opened up for the Frankfurt School. Not that these areas were not already opening. But the Institute could give them a laying-on of hands, a subtle prestige, which was of incalculable importance. And there was, at hand, a vast recruitment pool.

Franklin Roosevelt's Federal Works Project Administration had created a Writers Project, an Artists Project, a Federal Theater. In all these the Communist Party and its adjuncts were dominant. In the Writers Project, one could automatically be accepted by presenting a Party card, and going on welfare. Ditto the Artists Project, and the dance groups. In the Federal Theater Project, while non-Communist actors were sleeping in hallways, the favored were making sufficiently strong reputations to branch out into their own groups. The Party had its own repertory company, Theater Union, which took over Eva Le Gallienne's old theater on New York's 14th Street, substituting for *Peter Pan* its heavy-hand-

ed agit-prop. But on Broadway, it had its highly profitably Group Theater, its actors and playwrights such as John Garfield, Luther Adler, and Clifford Odets moving to Hollywood. For Hollywood producers, there was profit in this invasion, for these newcomers had a built-in claque on the East and West coasts which touted everything they did as the work of genius.

The theater was not closed to non-Communists, but anyone showing the least antagonism to the Party or to the Soviet Union usually had a difficult time, and was often forced to strike his colors. The Paramount Pictures producer-director Boris Morros established a working arrangement with the NKVD, to which he later confessed. Established stars like John Wayne, Irene Dunne, Adolph Menjou, and others were characterized as "fascist" and "anti-Semitic"—Gary Cooper's polo team being denounced in the *New Masses* as a clandestine Nazi cavalry troop—and the less famous being quietly ignored. Morrie Ryskind, at the time one of the highest paid screen writers, was eventually blacklisted. In later years, Jane Fonda, who had dabbled with treason by propagandizing in North Vietnam for the Communist enemy, would receive awards for her alleged good deeds. Jules Dassin, an utter unknown, directed the Communist Party pageant in New York's Madison Square Garden in 1939, and was awarded an immediate Hollywood contract, along with Hanns Eisler who wrote the music.

In the music world, the Institute's Otto Klemperer, officially connected with the Frankfurt School but rejecting Adorno's assaults and playing Bach in four-square Germanic manner, rose rapidly as a conductor with the major orchestras. Kurt Weill, also officially connected with the Institute, rose to heights in the theater and music world, putting aside Theodor Adorno's drive-the-audience-mad precept to profit vastly writing for Broadway musicals.[26] Hanns Eisler, too, prostituted his "proletarian" efforts, not lolling in the musical comedy field, but carrying the musical equivalent of an AK-47 as one of the Hollywood commissars.

Hollywood gave Bertold Brecht of the Institute a sinecure, though it is hard to discover exactly what he did for his money except swear, chew on unlit cigars, and flee from regular ablutions. As has been noted Alexander Korda, of the Bela Kun regime, carried the ball in England's film world, joining Kim Philby in MI-6

and being knighted for his patriotic services. The direct Commissar was Otto Katz, working closely with Hanns's brother Gerhard, for a time Comintern kingpin in the U.S. They had a working cell to direct, with John Howard Lawson and Donald Ogden Stewart, as assistant commissars; Lillian Hellman and Dashiell Hammett who brought with them the backing of New York's Park Avenue pinks; screen writer Dalton Trumbo; the brilliant actor-director Elia Kazan (fresh from the Group Theater); and scores of others. With the Frankfurt School, they made one big force for the softening-up of America.

Their mission was not to produce agit-prop movies or propaganda romances, though they sneaked in one or two like the blatantly Stalinist *Mission to Moscow*, but to control the industry. In many instances, the Eisler-Katz cabal, its ideology flavored by the Frankfurt School's neo-Marxism-neo-Freudianism, was really Hollywood's hiring hall. Writers who did not bow to the party line lost out on the important assignments, or like John O'Hara were made to feel so unwanted they left of their own accord. Except for stars too big to touch, the same applied to actors. The flattery-machine kept directors and producers in line, and when this failed, there were the homosexuality rumors. Party loyalty even began to undermine Hollywood's notorious nepotism.

But there was an even more important side to the Hollywood operation—money. The Frankfurt School, through its Comintern affiliates, made the Hollywood left-wing plutocrats, and even their less leftists friends, feel that their tremendous salaries were somehow blood-money which in part should be donated to Party-fronts for the betterment of the world. Records show that "causes" like the Joint Anti-Fascist this or the Spanish Civil War that brought in millions of dollars to Comintern coffers, almost none of which was received by those for whom it was collected. In the case of Spain, for example, the Loyalist government did not lack funds, its problem being that because of British and U.S. policies it could not buy desperately needed weapons, and thereby forcing it to surrender control to the Soviet Union. Part of those millions, as doled out by Otto Katz and Gerhard Eisler, went to clandestine activities such as the Frankfurt School, to the enrichment of luxury-prone Max Horkheimer.

But more important than the money and the hiring hall was

the product. Lenin had pioneered in his understanding of films as vitally important in making or breaking a nation's culture. The strategy of Otto Katz and the Hollywood commissars was to turn filmdom from an entertainment center into the dispenser of horror, bloody violence, indiscriminate mayhem, gross sexuality, and unlimited vulgarity, eventually couched in obscenities that once would have brought the police into every theater and movie house. The result: blood and obscenity now ooze out of movie houses and prime time television. Hollywood has become a cultural cesspool, to political applause. And children, learning the lesson well that only hedonism and sexual predilections count, brought to school what they saw on the tube. Anything goes, the indoctrination went, so long as it is pleasurable or supplies "self-esteem."[27]

Publishing

In the publishing world—books, newspapers, etc.—no problems existed. The Party had its own house, International Publishers, headed by its own Alexander Trachtenberg. But "legitimate" publishing houses, from the liberal to conservative, had their cells, part of a coalition which, to this writer's knowledge and sorrow, met regularly to consider which among the crop of books to be published should be touted or torpedoed, according to their political orientation. Certain writers were automatically blacklisted—and the findings of the cells were passed on to the major book-review media—the *New York Times* Sunday book section; the *New York Herald-Tribune*'s counterpart, edited by Irita Van Doren; and the *Saturday Review of Literature*, which echoed both. Old and traditional publishing houses like Boston's Little-Brown found themselves with Communist editors. Books on the Far East would be passed around to a gaggle of left-wing or secretly Communist reviewers—Owen Lattimore, John K. Fairbank and others of the Red China Lobby who could be counted on to praise each other's works. Former members of the Institute who had seen the light, scholars like Karl Wittfogel, were ignored or their works denigrated.

Like Abou ben Adhem, the university presses led all the rest in publishing the voluminous works of Frankfurt School scholars. In all this output, almost no critical work on Critical Theory can

be found. Add to this the contribution of enormously rich young "intellectuals" whose Modern Age Books introduced America to the quality paperback. "Its list," the late Benjamin Stolberg remarked, "reads like an American Bolshevik Five Foot Shelf," the works of the friends and allies of the Frankfurt School such as Granville Hicks, John Strachey, and the stars of the *New Masses* included.

As for the media—newspapers and the so-called "butcher-paper" weeklies—the record is significant. One need pay no attention to the *Daily Worker*, the West Coast *People's World*, or the ubiquitous house-organs of Communist-controlled unions and organizations. *The Nation* was doing yeoman work for the Party line. The *New Republic* could have in those days been called the voice of the Institute, resounding as it did with the lucubrations of Walter Lippmann. For a time too *Partisan Review*, which had a tremendous impact on academic and freelance intellectuals, filled that role until it moved from Stalinism, and only a few weeklies such as the anti-communist-anti-fascist *New Leader*, secretly financed by David Dubinsky's International Ladies Garment Workers and Alex Rose's Hatters, tried to stem the tide.[28]

The tabloid newspaper *PM.* was part of the neo-Marxist-neo Freudian network. Its backers were Marshall Field, John Hay Whitney, Philip A. Wrigley, Lessing Rosenwald, and other multimillionaires always ready to open their wallets to the Left. The editor was Ralph Ingersoll, a cast-off of the Luce publishing empire, whose fabulous parties were financed by a row of one-arm bandits in the foyer of his Park Avenue apartment, and much of its staff was recruited from Stalinist ranks It could be given to blatant anti-Semitism like its block-type headline page one banner on the assassination of General Walter Krivitsky, defected head of Soviet Western European Intelligence: "Who Is Schmelke Ginsberg." Its most famous staffer was I.F. Stone who violently denied that he was a Communist, though the Venona intercepts later disclosed that he was on the NKVD payroll. When it ran out of its first million and a half, Marshall Field poured in additional millions, to atone, as his neo-Freudian psychiatrist Gregory Zilboorg convinced him, for his vast fortune.

Since jazz, swing, and folk music—unremittingly deplored in the USSR—reached out to the young and impressionable, it be-

came the target for the "respectable" adjunct of cultural Marxism—and the *apparat* disgorged its PhDs, its jitterbugs, and its longhairs to preach that jazz was exclusively the black man's doing and purview, and the musical voice of the revolution. John Hammond (Party name, Henry Johnson), a rich Yalie, became a major influence in the jazz world—to his credit discovering or focusing attention on great jazz artists like Benny Goodman, Count Basie, Teddy Wilson, Billie Holiday, and others—but working mightily to bring them into the Marxist periphery and sponsoring the great *New Masses* Carnegie Hall concert, "From Spirituals to Swing." Two of the most successful jazz nightclubs in New York, Cafe Society Downtown in Greenwich Village and Cafe Society Uptown on the fashionable East Side, were originally financed by the Comintern, with cover from Party members. At the same time, powerful jazz *aficionados* slammed doors on their equally dedicated though anti-Communist jazz buffs.[29]

The take-over of power in Germany by Adolf Hitler had brought the Frankfurt School to New York. The muscle of John Dewey, Robert MacIver, Robert Lynd, and other academic heavyhitters put the School in control of Teachers College and the National Education Association. World War II put leaders and middle-rankers of the Frankfurt School into positions where they were guiding U.S. political and military policy in Europe and labored mightily to turn what became the Federal Republic of Germany into a Communist state. The door of opportunity was (1) the Office of the Coordinator of Information (COI); (2) its successor, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS); and (3) the congeries of technical and technological organizations which supplied the military with data. The source for the information, for the personnel, and for the broad knowledge came for the most part from the academic world.

The U.S. military, when it began to face the problems of the impending war, was organized to fight World War I. It had ignored any new strategy of air warfare, it was behind the Germans in the uses of new weapons, and it thought that the Nazi concept of the blitzkrieg was mere talk. It had faith in the Maginot Line, and it considered Hitler a blustering demagogue. When Charles Lindbergh informed the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines of what the Wehrmacht and the Luftwaffe were about, he was at-

tacked as anti-American. When Lindbergh demonstrated incredible bravery in the air combat over Tarawa, word of it was suppressed until returned Marine fliers told the story. The military and the Intelligence establishment turned as its major source to those with special knowledge of Europe, particularly Central Europe, academic and sociologist refugees who had lived their lives there and had been witnesses to the rise of Hitler. They fell into two classes: those whose major loyalty was to the Soviet Union and who wanted postwar Europe under Communist control, and those who were genuinely anti-Fascist and pro-Allied. The military was made up of brilliant soldiers, rising in the hierarchy; of time-servers who saw the war mainly as a way to higher rank; and of unsophisticated military technicians like General Leslie Groves who was in charge of developing the A-bomb.[30] It was also made up of shrewd but discerning politicians like generals George C. Marshall, Dwight D. Eisenhower (who rose with lightning speed from lieutenant-colonel to Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in Europe), and lesser lights like Lucius Clay. Left-thinking academics throve among them.

The history of the CIA and OSS is complex and controversial. But this much is fact, as has already been indicated. The British under William ("Intrepid") Stephenson, who had set up an extensive propaganda, espionage, and on occasion mayhem-and-violence networks in the U.S., partly financed by the Rockefellers, to lead the country into war, realized that American military, diplomatic, and political Intelligence was a shambles.

The solution: a centralized intelligence organization, which would by-pass and rank the services agencies but be controlled by the British. The perfect leader for such an agency was "Wild Bill" Donovan, a man of unquestioned personal courage, high public relations marks, and a cousin of President Roosevelt. Truly in charge of organization and operations was "Charles "Dickie" Ellis, second in command of British Intelligence Services in America under Stephenson, whose record as a GRU mole in MI-6 has already been told and a member in good standing of the GRU, and one of the Abwehr's own—a triple agent.[31]

It may be that at some point, an objective and accurate history of the Office of Strategic Services will be written. To date there have been glorifications, on-the-one-hand-on-the-other accounts,

and straight diatribes. The field staff was made up of the likes of Abraham Lincoln Brigade Major Milton Wolf and his crew, *Daily Worker* editor and Spanish war commissar John Gates, etc., etc. Allan Dulles and OSS laid its main lines into Germany through Noel Field, formerly of the State Department, known to the FBI and the White House as a Soviet agent, who ignored anti-Communist Germans and worked mainly with the *Rote Kapelle*, the Soviet Union's chief underground and espionage organization in Germany.

For those who enjoy fictionalized history, there is Stewart Alsop's account. His book recalls the one-liner by Sir Wilmot Lewis, dean of British correspondents in Washington, on Eliot Roosevelt's book on FDR: "The boy didn't understand what the grown men were saying." Aides to General Mark Clark , commander of the Fifth Army in Italy, would report with some bitterness after the war that our intelligence in southern Europe, an OSS responsibility, was almost non-existent, forcing the Fifth Army to depend on the British, whose reports put their own interests foremost. The Holahan case, in which an OSS major parachuted behind enemy lines in Italy and was assassinated by members of his own team and by Italian *partigiani*, was hardly unique. Highly recommended soldiers such as myself were brought into OSS and then fired summarily because they were "too anti-Communist." As in the China-Burma theater, under General Stilwell, the careers and sometimes the fate of OSS personnel frequently depended on whether they were reliably anti-Chiang Kai Shek and pro-Mao.

Individuals lived or died as a result of OSS political bias , but diplomatic, political, and national policy depended on the work of the OSS Research & Analysis branch. And it was particularly and emphatically in the Central-European desk that the Frankfurt School attempted, and almost succeeded in making the American, British, and French Zones copies of what became the Deutsche Democratische Republik.

★ ★ ★

[12]

The Institute Wars on Germany and America

Perhaps the most shockingly important chapter in the history of the International Institute for Social Research is its role in World War II, through its significant participation in wartime Intelligence and postwar policy-influencing. But far more important, in its efforts to remake Germany and Eastern Europe in the image of Joseph Stalin, was the effectiveness of the Frankfurt School in shaping the minds and the ideologies of the many unsuspecting young academics who were exposed to and indoctrinated in Critical Theory during their wartime service in OSS, the Office of War Information (OWI), and other Intelligence groups. Once released from the bondage of wartime service, these academics fanned out over colleges and universities, innocently bringing with them what they had learned in the service. But for the success of this indoctrination, the history of the United States in the Twentieth century might be totally different.

Barry Katz's *Foreign Intelligence: Research & Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services 1942-1945,* while glorifying the role of the Frankfurt School is also honest enough to give away the plot, so that when conjoined with other information, the true picture begins to emerge. With the war's end, many scores of academics left government and military service to propagate enthusiastically what they had learned from their Frankfurt School masters in

OSS, OWI, and other wartime agencies—and much of this work was financed by the then U.S. Office of Education and the great and money-heavy foundations, such as the Rockefeller, the Field, the Ford, and the Carnegie bestowers of vast corporate cash.

Little has been reported of the core work of the OSS operation, the Research & Analysis Section. It was R & A which in effect brainstormed much of the ideological focus of the European campaign. This part of OSS had its allies throughout the wartime Administration, reaching to Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau, who played Trilby to Assistant Treasury Secretary (and Soviet agent) Harry Dexter White's Svengali—with a large assist from Lauchlin Currie, one of FDR's close White House advisers and a member in good standing, confirmed by the Venona intercepts, of the Soviet secret services, as well as the British Tavistock Institute and its Cambridge-Webbian outcroppings.

As has already been discussed, much of the responsibility for the presence in OSS of Comintern agents and of the Frankfurt School in R & A can be laid at the feet of MI-6's Charles ("Dickie") Ellis. "Wild Bill" Donovan, a World War I Army officer with no experience in Intelligence, relied heavily on Ellis to organize and staff the organization, leaving R & A functions to such academics as the poet Archibald Macleish, also under the sway of "Dickie" Ellis, who in turn delivered it to known "Marxist" individuals and groups, many of them aliens and some already under investigation by the FBI.

Even after Pearl Harbor, it became apparent that the armed services were totally unprepared for warfare in the European Theater of Operations (ETO). They even lacked up-to-date maps of Europe, the Mediterranean area, or the China-Burma Theater. Neither the State Department nor the technical agencies had any real idea of the economic strengths, weaknesses, or internal organization of the Axis powers. Military strategy and tactics, such as the Wehrmacht had tested in Spain, had been given but passing thought by U.S. military planners. UAW president Walter Reuther was attempting to pressure President Roosevelt into giving up emphasis on the heavy bombers which plastered Germany and Japan and to producing instead 50,000 fighters. R & A was called on to meet the demands of the Armed Services for what they lacked in basic knowledge and intelligence.

At Ellis's urging, Donovan and MacLeish appointed Franz Neumann of the Frankfurt School to staff R & A, and thus were Frankfurtians Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Friedrich Pollock, Leo Lowenthal, and others less known, hired. Neumann even offered Donovan his files (and the Institute's) of German business leaders, singled out because they were anti-Marxist and therefore not to be trusted in the invasion and reconstruction of the Reich. As even Barry Katz, Marcuse's biographer and drumbeater for the Critical Theorists, has written: "The imagination reels at this Who's Who of luminaries and at the radical tendencies with which the American intelligence establishment [was being recruited]."

As one high OSS official remarked, "In the Central European Section the *lingua franca* is broken English," and he might have added, fluent Marxism. This was considered amusing, but hardly laughable to other German scholars, genuinely loyal to the country that gave them refuge who were rejected by R & A. At an Army language school at Cornell University, where enlisted men of high IQ were being taught foreign languages for service overseas or in OSS, the head of the Russian program Vladimir Kazekevich, a registered Soviet agent, lectured that the American Army was made up of cowards because it did not open a "second front" as quickly as Stalin demanded—and then had the military threaten this writer, a PFC, with court martial for passing on those remarks to Frederick Woltman of the *New York World-Telegram*.

It was also a standing joke that there were "more Germans working for OSS than for Hitler's *Abwehr*"—and more Marxists than for the GRU. In Washington, OSS was known as O So Social, O So Secret, and O So Subversive. The field, or "cloak-and-dagger" operatives might have objected to these academics—but since they had been generously recruited from the Spanish Civil War's Abraham Lincoln Brigade and other collections of Communist activists, there was little protest. What Marcuse, musicologist and theoretician Adorno, or the adoring graduate students they and the other Critical Theorists brought in with them, knew about the effects of pinpoint bombing or the number of tins of food the Germans had squirreled away was never questioned. Having been out of Germany for a decade or more, how could they judge with any accuracy the number of Germans who had

put their lives on the line in covert opposition to *die schone Adolf*, or had joined the Nazis.

Where much of OSS information came, as it turned out, was not from the minds, experiences, and prejudices of the "academics" but from the solid research and the voluminous but until then forgotten files in the stacks of the Library of Congress, for which the "academics," trained in library research, took credit. Studies made by those sympathetic to the Critical Theorists, Barry Katz's being noteworthy, indicate conclusively that much that they claimed came out of their "recollections" had been mined from the Library of Congress. It was not very long before OSS discovered that dropping agents behind enemy lines. exciting as this might be, produced less than sweating over monographs, journals, newspapers, and other published or manuscript sources. Toward the last period of the war, R & A had collected 100,000 documents—library materials, overseas reports, maps, and regional surveys—of a "bewildering-range" and well beyond the scope of the Critical Theorists.

The condition of rail transport on the Russian front, the relations between aggression and business structure during the Weimar Republic, attitudes of the Roman Catholic Church of Hungary, the political ideas of Charles de Gaulle (available for a few francs in Paris before the Gestapo wiped out the *bouquinistes* along the Seine, or for a few shillings in London), the location of concentration camps, were important. But R & A psychologists listened to the speeches of Goebbels for "parapraxes" offering "clues" to impending military operations. Many of the reports, after they had filtered through R & A, were dead wrong in their predictions and misguided or deliberately distorted in their formulations, but this was a matter for internal debate only.

Fearing that the critically theoretical analysts might indulge in such practices, OSS sought to prevent them by laying down strict rules. The "sole purpose" of R & A, particularly the Central European Section was, in Katz's words, "to transform raw intelligence data into concise, factual, and rigorously objective analyses for the use of government agencies and the military, but'not to suggest, recommend, or in any way [attempt to] determine strategy or the tactical decisions of the war'." The Central European Section avoided these instructions by invoking the "discipline"

of "social science" which could make of Facts A, B, and C precisely what the "scientist" sought. The strength or vulnerability of a military target were assessed by non-military factors, among them what the Soviet general staff had in mind.

The "Second Front" is a case in point. Stalin wanted the Allied invasion of Europe to take pressure off his forces, whether it meant success or failure, and incalculable losses in men and materiel for Britain and the U.S. Since intelligence from OSS's Central European desk reaching General Eisenhower and SHAEF came mostly through Noel Field from the *Rote Kapelle,* steady pressure was exerted to move before Allied forces were ready Only the strong opposition to a premature second front by Prime Minister Churchill steadied the Allied strategy and blocked R & A's advice. Despite their alleged claims to objectivity, theoretical principles entered into the selection of data. This was particularly evident in the "guide books," prepared by R & A for military government. Their "purely factual information" pointed straight to a Communist or anarchic Germany. Their openly stated goal was to eradicate tendencies, based on family life and religious belief, which allegedly led to the triumph of Hitler. In other words, the substitution of 1843 cultural Marxism and a strong dash of neo-Freudianism for political and military strategy.

Postwar Plans

As the war progressed, R & A began assuming greater importance in plans for postwar strategy and tactics. It moved from its crowded quarters in the Library of Congress to other buildings, finally settling down in an apartment house across the road from the State Department, known affectionately to its neighbors as "that spy house"—headquarters for 900 scholars. And as OSS operations moved closer to the combat zones, Herbert Marcuse's Central European Section set up shop in London where it could be closer to the military leadership and to the centers of the nascent Allied Military Government.

The Central European Section was in many ways *sui generis* in OSS. It dealt directly with Eisenhower's Supreme Command and the Allied powers, since Germany was its focus. Through Deputy Director Allan Dulles's right-hand man, Noel Field (with wife Herta and "adopted daughter" Erika Glaser), it continued

to work clandestinely with the *Rote Kapelle* and the NKVD-GRU. With "Dickie" Ellis in tacit control of OSS, it had its rabbi where it most counted. An ONI officer who had to deal with the Section remarked in 1944 that it "remains brilliant, but incoherent, Teutonic, and maladministered." Marcuse, somewhat franker, would admit later that in the Section, "theoretical, political, and personal ties remained inextricably intertwined"—and paramount. There was an irony to this, for even as many right-wingers argued that liberalism led eventually to communism, the Critical Theorists held that liberalism led inexorably to fascism.

Barry Katz summed this up neatly:

> [A] distinctive theory of the inner mechanism of fascism was in place politically neutral and ostensibly emptied of normative content, the legal, constitutional, and *de facto* ideological principles enshrined under the liberal public, had come increasingly to be applied to the holders of political and economic power. The fascist attack against 'bourgeois' law and philosophy was then an attack only at the level of ideology. In reality, the Nazis only called the system by its name and enforced the realities of domination with the unmediated apparatus of the authoritarian state. As Marcuse would write in retrospect, 'If there was one matter about which the author and his friends were *not* uncertain, it was that *the fascist state was a liberal society,* and totalitarian violence and totalitarian reason came from the structure of existing society, which was in the process of overcoming its liberal past and incorporating its historical negation.' [Emphasis added]

This was vital doctrine to the Frankfurt School, for if it could convince the Allied powers and the military governments they were preparing to impose on a defeated Axis that "liberalism" was pre-fascism, then the only candidates for postwar European hegemony, particularly in Germany, would be Marxists. For the postwar academia and the ever-ready Rockefeller Foundation, this would later be the basis for "political correctness" and the vast intellectual scam of an "authoritarian personality." But the Central European Section went far beyond its "evaluations" and its ideological shunting. Before the so-called Morgenthau Plan had begun to materialize, the Critical Theorists were already compiling lists of the German military who would have to be "eradi-

cated " following the surrender—as well as thousands of officials alone, plus additional thousands of non-Nazi businessmen and professionals. The very anti-Nazis who under Konrad Adenauer, *der Alte*, would create a prosperous, free, and modern Germany were on the proscribed lists, prepared by R & A with thousands of pages of other "directives," in violation of OSS orders.

The Central European Section, i.e., Marcuse & Co., was shrewd enough not to attempt to ram their conclusions down the throats of the unassorted PhDs they were directing, but went through the process of "reasoned debate" in which conclusions were foregone. Foremost in their agenda was the concept of "unconditional surrender," later buttressed by the Morgenthau Plan, which would leave Germany and Central Europe in the total collapse which the 1843 Karl Marx advocated.

The military news could be cut-and-dried. This town had been taken, that town lost. Oil supplies were thus, food thus. There were shortages her, overages there. The figures could be strictly accurate, soft, or false. How great was the destruction of infrastructure by Allied bombing and how rapidly was it being rebuilt? These were considered of far less importance than "morale." Marcuse would argue that by spreading rumors of infectious tuberculosis German military operations would skitter, while Neumann considered it of tremendous strategic importance that the Nazis were standardizing the design of coffins.

But the Critical Theorists in the Central European Section were undivided on one point: The defeat of the German army would not bring victory. Only the defeat of "fascist liberalism" would be of significance. As to "morale," well, the Critical Theorists had nightmares over the possibility of an internal anti-Nazi movement or a military *putsch* against Hitler and the *partei*. Demographics, the people's feelings, shortages of food, making the life of the ordinary German unbearable, or so the Critical Theorists argued, would only make Hans fight the harder for the Fuehrer. As late as 27 September 1943, the Central European Section was insisting to General Eisenhower that only the small but gung-ho Communist underground in Germany should be allowed to bring down Hitler.

The mechanism was there. Almost everything that reached OSS from the field, via the Allen Dulles-Noel Field operation in

Switzerland, was first sifted, weighed, evaluated, and systematized by the Marcuse team for use by the military and diplomatic planners at the State Department, the Treasury, and the Pentagon. Final appraisal was often in the hands of Harry Dexter White and Lauchlin Currie. White has been downgraded as merely one of those who passed on classified material to Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley. But his actual status, however, was summarized in Earl Latham's soft-line *The Communist Controversy in Washington.*

Wrote Latham in 1966:

> Harry Dexter White was one of the most influential men in international affairs in the 1940s, entrusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau., with vast responsibility and discretion . . . full responsibility for all matters of foreign relations in which the Treasury was concerned, and later for all economic and financial matters in which the Treasury was involved with the Army and Navy. White was the dominating figure at the Bretton Woods Monetary conference that launched the International Bank and Fund of which he was to become the first Executive Director. He had much to do with the Morgenthau Plan for the "pastoralization" of Germany [one of Stalin's prime postwar aims] and he was the author of some of the material which went into the "ultimatum" that Secretary of State Hull delivered to the Japanese on 26 November 1941 [one of the direct causes for the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Of the ultimatum, Henry Stimson, then Secretary of War, warned FDR, "This means war."] Even these very few examples of White's responsibilities show that his impact in public affairs was of tremendous significance for national policy.

That White was on the receiving end of the Central European Section's product was attested to by spy-courier Elizabeth Bentley, who delivered its reports to the NKVD. White's influence was such that his recommendation almost guaranteed appointment to any critical job.[32] His word was sufficiently influential, when OSS was raiding academia for "analysts," to allow it to recruit a Frankfurt School delegation, in violation of strict regulations barring employment in OSS of enemy aliens and Comintern adherents.

Duncan Lee, a top OSS legal advisor to "Wild Bill" Donovan, was passing on to Elizabeth Bentley material which White was getting from the Central European Section. Lee, it should be noted, was brought into the *apparat* by Mary Price, Walter Lippmann's personal and confidential secretary. Since Lippmann was on a first-name basis with the highest officials in government, the Duncan Lee-Mary Price-Dexter White-Central European Section cabal was invaluable to the Kremlin.[33]

Beyond this, and of perhaps even greater policy importance, was the cleavage within the State Department. Officially Cordial Hull was Secretary of State, but this bluff, and sometimes rough Southerner, was out-of-sync with FDR and the White House "brain trust"—and anathema to Harry Hopkins, in time disclosed in Soviet files as an "agent of influence." On matters of high policy involving the Soviets, Hull was eliminated from "the Loop," and FDR dealt directly with Undersecretary Sumner Welles who with Harry White and Lauchlin Currie made up a powerful *troika.* One of the few men in the Department trusted by Hull was Raymond Murphy, among other things the keeper of DOS security files which he kept in heavily-locked steel cabinets in his personal office.[34] The Frankfurt School contingent in OSS was hardly an isolated group of "scholars" and ideologues, and often its whisper had the echo of doom. Through White, Currie, Hiss, and Comintern regulars like Marcuse, it had a two-way communication both with Moscow and its *Residentz* in the States. And in an issue of vital importance to Stalin, the future of Germany, it played a highly significant role.

From the early days of the Soviet revolution, as this account has discussed at length, the aims of both Lenin, his successors, and German military and economic power centers had been to merge and harness German know-how and organizational genius to Russia's great natural resources. This policy had been signed, sealed, and delivered—or so Stalin, the Politburo, the German General Staff, and Germany's equivalent of a "military-industrial complex" believed—until Hitler decided that he could have the Russian heartland, resources, and manpower, at his disposal without having to share it with Stalin. It was a beautiful concept, and it persisted even into the late post-World War II years in the

hearts of Germany's socialist Chancellor Willi Brandt, Russia's Gorbachev and others.

From the moment that Nazidom's defeat was clear, Stalin and his agents were working on "the German question." The cultural Marxists believed that the "peace" could so be arranged that Germany would become a fifth-rate country under the total domination of the USSR. It was the position of General Marshall and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that after a Hitler defeat there would have to be an orderly restoration of German legitimacy and government. Marshall was convinced that the plans being developed by the Central European Section, with the concurrence of Welles, Currie, and White would let U.S. and Allied forces be "bog[ged] down into a morass of economic wreckage."

At a 7 August 1944, meeting, however, Eisenhower, White, and Morgenthau, with the tacit approval of FDR, sided with the Marcusites. Five days later White, echoing the position of Marcuse and the Central European Section, stated sternly: "To return Germany as a respectable member of the family of nations would be to put Germany in a position where she could again endeavor to become ruler of the world." When it was pointed out that the policy for Germany demanded by Stalin would not allow the country to feed its population, White snapped: "Throw the rest of them into North Africa!"[35]

The Central European Section next took up Stalin's alternative, the division of Germany into "zones" governed by the wartime belligerents. This would not have turned all of Germany into the economic disaster area the Soviets and Marcuse and Harry Dexter White wanted, but it would give Stalin hegemony over a large section of the country and also an excuse for retaining military and political control over Eastern and Central Europe. What the Soviets had lost, they thought to recover through the influence of Marcuse, Horkheimer and other Central Theorists who had returned to Germany as "advisers," official and otherwise, to the organizers of the military government, Gen. Lucius Clay and John McCloy. The more dramatic results we know as the Berlin Wall, and the establishment of Red Fascism in East Germany.

The Morgenthau Plan was shelved and postwar Germany taken out of the hands of Harry Dexter White and a Herbert

Marcuse, who had moved to the State Department after the demise of the Office of Strategic Services. At State, his ideas were not as offensive as his German accent to Ivy League careerists, and Marcuse moved on to academic pastures. Thus Marcuse, the Critical Theorists, and the small army of PhDs they had indoctrinated launched a new, quiet, but spectacularly successful academic invasion.

★ ★ ★

[13]

Lewin, Women's Lib & Correctness

It is no *reductio ad absurdum* to this survey of neo-Marxist-neo-Freudianism, otherwise known as Critical Theory, to focus on one Kurt Lewin—like all of his associates in the Institute, both in Frankfurt and Morningside Heights, sharing Karl Marx's virulent racism, anti-Semitism, and rhetorical legerdemain. He was not the most brilliant nor the most demagogic of his associates in the Frankfurt School, but he was certainly the most persuasive and perhaps the most influential, a kind of Johnny Appleseed of Critical Theory, in university and government positions—any government would do—planting the neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian seeds[36] among liberal faculty and students, to sprout and be reaped by his more overtly aggressive followers. Herbert Marcuse could and did play the academic game and simultaneously wave the bloody banner. Lewin worked both the academic and the bureaucratic fronts suavely and diplomatically.

Where Marcuse could be referred to in FBI chatter as "the reddest red-hot of the red-hots," orating from his professorial dais while linking arms with the most violent terrorists in American history, Lewin moved from academia to government post and back, quietly indoctrinating and even more quietly translating the Marx of 1843 into the lingo of the mid-Twentieth century. It was said of him by both admirers and detractors that Lewin could

have simultaneously won the *Légion d'Honneur*, a *Hakenkreuz*, a Medal of Freedom, and the Lenin Prize. Academicians twittered not at all when Lewin asserted with a straight face that autocracy and laissez-faire were synonymous.[37]

Harvard sociologist Gordon Allport, himself enamored of any discourse on method coming from the Institute, hailed "the revolution that Lewin created in the scientific study of man in society—a revolution more due to his work in social psychology than to the work of any other behavioral scientist." His biographers offered as his greatest contribution "sensitivity training"—a polite term for brainwashing—which he helped create as "the most significant educational innovation of the century." While Marcuse was taking major credit for the creation of the New Left and its alliance with terrorists groups, Lewin was quietly laying a groundwork, lecturing world-wide and solidifying the Frankfurt School's most important liaison to the Tavistock Institute—the advocate of violence as long as it was directed at white society, the supporter and organizer of "intellectual support" for "ethnic violence," and one of the theoreticians for the obliteration of all who disagreed with Critical Theory.

Chosen by academia and the U.S. Intelligence agencies, Lewin was the "undisputed intellectual leader" of the group that brought brainwashing to American education, according to Kurt Back, author of *Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training*. There were some who ranked him as a leader with John Dewey, many of whose ideas Lewin incorporated in his "philosophy" of education. He was "like that" with President Lyndon Johnson. Stanford University invited him for a six-month stint as a visiting professor. He was a lecturer at Japan's Kyushu University. Moscow University sought him out, and Cornell University ditto. In the U.S. he moved from university to university, followed by worshippers like Columbia's Margaret Mead who later worked for him in OSS. The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fund opened its coffers to him—and Gardner Murphy, head of Columbia's psychology department, touted him to his students as a thinker and theorist of "great importance."

The Frankfurt School's Karl Korsch, perhaps the most solidly grounded Critical Theorist and a member of the Comintern, collaborated with Lewin on *Constructive Psychology and Sociology*. The

government was not far behind. Lewin had both hand and foot in the Office of Naval Research. Not to be outdone OSS lauded Lewin's "very creative contributions to the working out of proper relations between psychological warfare, target setting, field operations, and evaluative reconnaissance," and found a post for him. He was also called in to study America's "food habits" which developed into a study on "changing of behavior." After the war, with funds supplied by the National Institute of Mental Health, the U.S. Air Force, and the Field, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations, he set up the Research Center on Group Dynamics and the National Training Laboratory—behavioral and "sensitivity" think tanks, devoted to selling and justifying policies the Soviets were attempting to foist on Britain, France, and the U.S.[38]

The Frankfurt School's interest in feminism, "radical" or in its turn-of-the-century "social" phase, was but a small part of its ideological baggage. Though the "woman question" kept popping up in the screeds of cultural Marxism, it was always a kind of sidebar to its support of matriarchy. Marx himself was no crusader for embattled womanhood and in his personal life, he was vicious, domineering and antagonistic to women.[39] If the Critical Theorists had formal or informal relationships with women, they never figured significantly in their writings, though some of them indulged in serial marriage. For the cultural Marxists, women were considered mainly as allies against "patriarchy and the family," much as they felt about all races other than the Teutonic, useful in bringing down the structure of Western culture but basically inferior. Lewin and his disciples remembered what the latter-day Institute for Social Research sometimes forgot, that direct revolutionary violence could not succeed, and that the original Marxist concept, as combined with neo-Freudianism, abjured the frontal assault and called for "boring from within" in education and in communications. To Muenzenberg's strategy of capturing the intellectuals. Lewin skillfully included the media. His contribution to brainwashing was the afore-mentioned "sensitivity training" which would de-fang the entrepreneur class, take over community leadership and industrial corporate management, and dumb-down higher education.

The question before Lewin, faced by what seemed the invulnerabilities of the American system, was: How can the radical fac-

tion of the establishment, though it controls the educational establishment and the foundations with their vast funds, create the kind of society which will collapse of its own stupidity? Lewin's contribution was to take the idea of "democracy" and to redefine it to include every left-totalitarian concept, every aberrant behavior, every form of anti-social violence, and every "multi-cultural" and "diversity" cause, thereby transmogrifying it into "the permanent cultural revolution."

Regularly popping up in the writings of cultural Marxism, Kurt Lewin himself was no crusader for embattled womanhood. In his personal life, he was domineering, and antagonistic in his dealings with women. If most of the latter-day theorists ever had relations with women, they never figured with any significance in their writings. Women were considered mainly as allies in the war against the family, much as was felt about races other than the Teutonic—useful in bringing down the structure of Western culture, but basically inferior. In fact, the Critical Theorists had no objection to their colleague Wilhelm Reich's sexual program which exalted the orgasm but deplored its heterosexual consequences. The Radical Feminists favored the vibrator to the male organ and Sapphism to heterosexuality, and applauded male homosexuality since it not only kept men away from women but debased their own sexual status. No homosexual, moreover, would seek to retain "patriarchy."

Bettye Goldstein

Given all his activities, it is perhaps ironic that Lewin will probably go down in the history books as the man who inspired a relatively young far-left Indiana activist—communist in ties and experience, though denying anything closer to the CP than an application for membership in the Young Communist League (YCL)—into launching two movements clearly among the most destructive of our times: "women's liberation" and "political correctness." Her name was Bettye Naomi Goldstein, a pretty girl who throughout most of her life affected a determined frowziness which she employed to justify the denigration of males and their sexual equipment. She was particular resentful of her nose, though hardly of Cyranoic proportions, which like so many suffering from "Jewish self-hate" she insisted was the cause of the

(imaginary) anti-Semitism she encountered and expected everywhere.

As an adolescent she was given to towering rages, especially against her family which she bitterly resented, with emphasis on an immigrant father who, Jewish accent and all, had moved up from peddler to owner of a jewelry shop known as "the Tiffany of Peoria." To the "anti-Semitism" encountered during her high school years, she would later add the "economic insecurity" of a life-style which included a fine home, maids, chauffeurs, butlers, and other amenities In elementary school she is credited with having struck one boy with a hoe, tearing a handful of hair from a girl friend's head, and throwing a book at her sister with such force that hospitalization was required. Nevertheless both academically and extra-curricularly she had an outstanding high school career.

At Smith, she continued her academic and extracurricular successes, particularly in campus journalism and in writing. But it was also as an undergraduate that she came under the tutelage of two crypto-communist members of the faculty who led her down the path of the activism which was her life for many years, her interest being a merging of "anti-fascism:," "anti-anti-Semitism," and psychology. The facts of her activism need not be retold here and can be found in nasty detail in the biography of one-time Communist David Horowitz. But her left-wing theatrics did not come to focus until she took a summer course, after her sophomore year, under Kurt Lewin at the University of Iowa. He was then dabbling in new and old theories and concepts of psychology, from *Gestalt* to the ultra-contemporary, with a Critical Theorist slant merging them with neo-Freudianism. Bettye Goldstein fell under the spell of his tutelage.

Under other circumstances, Bettye Goldstein might have moved brilliantly into a career in psychology, psychiatry, and psychoanalytic research. But these conflicted with the lure of journalism and the anti-male obsessions she had been developing since childhood. Marxism had an appeal which had seduced the Bloomsbury bohemians, the Ivy League revolutionists, and the literary intellectuals. Her career then took the "traditional" turn of the 1930s and 1940s. She served her term at the extremist-left Highlander Folk School; she was trusted enough to be allowed to

have an affair with a young scientist working at Los Alamos, who was connected to the NKVD-GRU and with agent/assassin Steve Nelson, fresh from the carnage of Spain and a deputy on atomic espionage for Comintern-NKVD bosses Otto Katz and Gerhard Eisler. She held important posts with the United Electrical Workers union, later expelled from the CIO because of Communist control. Her work there was with UE's publications, though she would later insist that her main interest was not Communism but to give women a break in the union's officialdom.

Then Bettye Goldstein married Carl Friedan—dropping the "e" in her first name and inaugurating a career as a magazine writer on woman's subjects as Betty Friedan. Her past as a communist activist disappeared, or was denied, and she claimed to be an ex-housewife out to right the wrongs against woman. According to the new Betty Friedan, she had spent her life as a subjugated woman, a suburban wife cooking for her husband, cleaning house, and raising kids. Her husband, whom she divorced, has noted that she spent most of her time during their marriage writing and propagandizing, and seldom at home. Betty Friedan insisted on the validity of her new persona, in the 1990s denouncing her former political and ideological admirer, Daniel Horowitz, for making public her past activist Party role.

What she got from Kurt Lewin was threefold.

Primo. "Classical Marxism" was no longer of "revolutionary" validity. This appealed to Betty Friedan who had far less interest in socialist *cum* Marxist economics than in concepts of penis envy. She had, in fact, been groping towards the Frankfurt School amalgam of neo-Marxism-neo-Freudianism which strict Party entities like the U.E. and the Highlander Folk School considered heretical. The obscene extremism of Wilhelm Reich and his dedication to the male-induced orgasm repelled her since she, as well as the women's liberationists who followed her, reasoned that heterosexuality still celebrated female sexual subservience.

Secundo. The cultural mainstream was beginning to flow away from the professors at Smith and elsewhere who had "developed" her "revolutionary spirit" and pushed her into the Party's YCL vestibule. Fighting for wages and hours lacked the glamour of taking on the entire male sex.

Finally. As Kurt Lewin carefully instructed her, the battle for

"women's liberation" and "women's rights" could be a potent tool in destroying those elements of the "bourgeois" society which stood between Greenwich Village rebellion and the Frankfurt School heaven.

How much of this Betty Friedan, liberated from Bettye Goldstein's comfortably prosperous suburban life, really believed is a matter for debate. Her intellectual capabilities were indeed great, but so were her powers of self-deception and self-indulgence, and radical feminism provided many satisfactions: an attack on religion and on her immigrant Jewish father; war on the family unit and all family relations; a personal hatred over a "patriarchy" under which women "suffered"; and destruction of male-dominated society in which women were allegedly little more than prostitutes.

Victory of Matriarchy

The ultimate goal was the rooting out of penises and the victory of matriarchy. But along the way was the systematic humiliation of the male so that society would bumble and fumble and end up in the kind of impotence which would allow a Critical Theorist takeover.

The tragedies, comedies, and tragicomedies of "women's lib" have elsewhere been at great length discussed, debated, and anatomized. That women should have the same political and economic rights as men few would challenge. But that a majority should be treated as an oppressed minority made little sense. Nevertheless, it became grounds for almost immediate decapitation to assert that there were vital and self-evident differences between men and women. Even to quote that old chestnut of the vaudeville straight man, "I can't *bear* children," became grounds for attack. That women could use obscene language in the company of men was considered proper, but let a man tell an off-color joke in the hearing of a woman, and he could easily lose his job and possibly his freedom. Words like *man*kind, as well as all others which included in sequence the letters *m-a-n*, became *verboten*. And it was suddenly fascist to refer to a "chair*man*" or a "chair*woman*." With ridiculous transmogrification, men and women suddenly became "chairs."

In his paper "Radical Feminism and Political Correctness," Dr. Gerald L. Atkinson pointed out:

> Perhaps no aspect of Political Correctness is more prominent in American life today than the ascendance of Feminist ideology. . . . Where do we see this Radical Feminist ascendancy? On television, where nearly every major offering has a female "power figure" and the plots and characters emphasize the inferiority of the male and the superiority of the female; in the military, where expanding opportunity for women, even in combat positions, has been accompanied by double-jointed and then lowered standards, as well as by a decline in enlistment of young men, while "warriors" in the services are leaving in droves; in government-mandated employment preferences and practices which benefit woman and use "sexual harassment" charges to keep men in line; in colleges where women's and gender studies proliferate; in other employment, public and private, where 'sensitivity training' has preempted unprecedented time and attention; in public schools, where "self-esteem" and [neuterizing drugs] are increasingly promoted while academic learning goes out the window. [T]he Radical Feminism movement is embraced within present day Political Correctness ideology, derived from cultural Marxism.

To this can be added the feminist campaign to teach little boys to sew and play with dolls while their sisters are playing cowboys and Indians (or Critical Theorists and Nazis). Daddy diapers the baby and prepares its formula, TV heroes and heroines are gays and lesbians; and the Virginia Military Academy and the Citadel, which turned out some of America's finest military men, become as coed as Vassar. The Feminization of the American male is a distinct part of Critical Theory's agenda. And for a reason. It brings back Bobby Kennedy's famous question about God: "How do you know She is not black?" If there is no "God, the Father," and under Radical Feminist pressure He is being neutered in today's feminist versions of the Old and New Testaments, then what happens to religion? And in practical terms, what happens to the family unit's hierarchy in which father and mother have their roles, as do children who must be taught how to fit into the societal structure? Under a matriarchal society, the male is a slave (the beehive is a good example) whose sole function is to fertilize the female and work stolidly in the ranks.

In *Essays on Our Times*, Dr. Atkinson writes:

> If this "Feminization" trend were driven only by Radical Feminists seeking to pull down a perceived male-dominated hierarchy, there would be more hope that the cycles of history would move toward a stable accommodation. But the drive is deeper and will not be satisfied by any accommodation. The Radical Feminists have embraced and been embraced by the wider and deeper movement of cultural Marxism. . . . The strategy is to attack at every point where an apparent disparity leaves a potential constituency of "oppressed" persons, in this case women, the largest of all constituencies. Cultural Marxists, men and women, are making the most of it, and the theory developed by the Frankfurt School provides the ideology [from] Engels' *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State.*

Lewin's discovery and development of Betty Friedan was more than auspicious. For having hidden her previous communist activism and her organizing skills under a suburban bikini, Betty Friedan was the perfect person to steer "women's liberation" partially away from its economic demands and its orgasm-on-demand dream-world, and to focus it on the "cultural" drive to debase the male, lesbianize the movement, and bring the society to crisis. The journalism and literature of our time are rife with examples of the androgynation of American culture. But of all these examples, among the most frightening is the feminization of the armed forces. Recall that the Israeli army, outnumbered in its original battles with Arab effectives, enlisted women for combat. But the Israelis quickly aborted the policy as field commanders learned that it was militarily counter-productive.

★ ★ ★

[14]

The Road to Destruction

In 1912, Woodrow Wilson, on his way from Princeton to the White House, brought out the fifteenth, and final, edition of a book he had been revising since his student days: *Constitutional Government*. In 1956, the book appeared in paperback with a long and typically foot-in-mouth introduction by Walter Lippmann which may some day be published with other works of that indomitable writer, perhaps under the title of "The Many Slips from the Cup to the Lippmann." The date is significant, for in the earlier versions of the book, the President-to-be made one point ignored by media and academic opinion makers for an unsound but important reason.

What Woodrow Wilson both pointed out and supported was that among the most valid functions of the Congress was the right and duty of "oversight" and "investigation" of all acts and functions of government, as well as those of the body politic. Part of these functions stemmed from the power to appropriate and some from the responsibilities inherent in the Constitution. If consumerists with their Pinocchio-like noses interfered in the course of the national life, then so too could Congress. But "investigation" got a bad name when it began to nose about some of the activities in which the Federal government was throwing its money, particularly those involving the Kremlin and its allies in-and-out of the national establishment.[40]

Congress periodically abdicates both its "oversight" and

"investigative" functions, particularly in such areas as education. The percentage of the budget which goes to "education," an activity nowhere found or implied in the Constitution, grows steadily, whereas educational performance slumps in inverse proportion to the dollars invested. Since the National Education Association (NEA) has more control over the educational process than either the voters or the Executive Branch, plus multimillions of political dollars, both the "oversight" and the "investigative" arms of Congress should be probing this interesting condition, but when the facts are made available, the media turns shyly away and Congress proposes even greater expenditures for a failing system.

Though not the greatest of Presidents, Wilson had a professorial awareness of the functions of American government, and he preached that the Congress had lost the control which "oversight" and "investigation" gave it. "Women's lib" opened the window and "political correctness" flew in. The media, which has sloughed off the whole question of "political correctness" made it seem as it was nothing more than a squabble over vocabulary. The record, however, is rife with examples drawn from repeated experiences, everywhere from the Ivy League to tank-town colleges, in which a faculty soaked in the precepts of the Frankfurt School and the NEA enforced them in the classroom. Students who attempted to assert the values of a traditional education were mocked, insulted, and penalized by the Marcusized faculty and the radicals to whom they lectured. Brilliant students who challenged cultural Marxism and its handmaiden neo-Freudianism received failing grades and had their themes held up to gross ridicule. Professors who upheld non-Marxist values were harassed, threatened, and charged with peddling "racism," "sexism" and other high crimes. Some professors resorted to delivering their classroom lectures with a tape-recorder before them, to protect themselves from distortion, rumors, false charges, and outright attack The day after 9/11 students and faculty in some institutions of higher learning were hazed because they expressed patriotic sentiments, and hanging the flag from dormitory windows was banned because it might be offensive to Arabs, their friends, and anti-patriots.

The methodology of "political correctness" was hardly new.

In the early days of the Soviet revolution, those great scientific heroes, hailed by Lenin and the Politburo, Pavlov and his salivating dog, were held up as the acme of science. Pavlov had demonstrated that flashing a red light simultaneously with giving a dog something succulent created a "conditioned reflex" so that in time the dog salivated merely at the flash of the red light. Under the tutelage of the Frankfurt School, students were transformed into dogs and cultural Marxist ideology became the red light. The response was a reflex reaction against all the values and the concepts that had motivated Western education.

The Pavlovian methodology on which the Moscow trials of the 1930s had relied was the parent of political correctness and so was the 1950s techniques of brainwashing. The "Old Bolsheviks" who stood up in Stalin's courts and accused themselves of great crimes against the state had first been prepared by the Pavlovian process. Muenzenberg, along with Lukacs and the founders of the Frankfurt School, had seen what in the West only Madison Avenue seems to have learned, that language leads to action — and that the control of words and their overtones can be far more effective than hand-grenades or nuclear power. To force or intimidate someone into saying "A" when he really believes "B" is most of the battle. The Tinkers-to-Evers-to-Chance in this were John Dewey, cultural Marxism, and the Frankfurt School. Erich Fromm and Herbert Marcuse would take it from there—out of the academy and into the larger world. But it was necessary first to subvert the educationists and their establishment.

This was not just a word-game. "Political correctness" was a way to repeal the First Amendment on campus and to destroy academic freedom. It was the entering wedge to the destruction of the entire academic system of education and its espousal of Western values, replacing it with the nihilism which the Critical Theorists saw as the pre-condition to the collapse of Western civilization and the rise of 1843 Marxism. Supplant Western culture, religion, and family values with ideological masturbation. Replace the family with promiscuity, and family influence with gonadal "independence." College dormitories went co-ed, and woe unto any student who believed that in his collegiate years education was more important than sex.

Multiculturalism

Political correctness opened the floodgates to "multiculturalism" and "diversity"—code words for the denial of the old curricula and the propaganda for replacing them with the study of mythical African societies and the equation of these myths with what had grown from the ancient Greeks, the religious systems of the Middle East, and the glories of the Renaissance, not to mention the culture, *mores*, and science of the Eighteenth to Twentieth centuries. Throw out Shakespeare, Cervantes, and the metaphysical poets for Allen Ginsberg and *Howl*. Tear that wonderful inheritance of the Baroque—and Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Berlioz, and Verdi — for the hate-filled and nails-on blackboard productions advocated by Theodor Adorno, not to mention the screeches of Iced T and "rap" artistry.[41] "Multiculturalism" became a meaningless excuse for not teaching anything of cultural value and a negation of intellectual history. The real multiculturalism is in the amalgam of the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Greek, Roman, Hebrew, Christian, Renaissance, Elizabethan, Germanic, and later European and American infusions.

Mobilizing the forces against free speech and free association, political correctness employed the techniques that Kurt Lewin, Betty Friedan, and their followers had developed against the right of free expression, the free flow of ideas, and all intellectual debate, and those techniques to wipe out in academia the very factors which made for education. An early statement in Carnegie-Mellon University's *Policy on Free Speech and Assembly*, published regularly in faculty and student handbooks, asserts that the school "encourages freedom of speech, assembly, and exchange of ideas"—which included "distributions of leaflets and petitions, as well as demonstrations or protests involving speaking, discussion or the distribution of information." And Carnegie-Mellon added: "The enforcement of these restrictions will not depend in any way on any subject matter involved in a protest or demonstration."

The statement of policy goes on:

> The assumptions of freedom are that men and women will more often than not choose wisely from among the alternatives available to them and that the range of their implications can be known fully only if men and women can express their thoughts freely . . . It is

> inevitable that from time to time circumstances appear to threaten the larger community in which it exists. When, as they will, speakers from within or outside the campus challenge the moral, spiritual, economic, or political consensus on the community, people are uneasy, disturbed, and at times outraged . . . . But freedom of thought and freedom of expression cannot be influenced by circumstances. They exist only if they are inviolable.

Under "political correctness" that process was revised, as viewed by Carnegie-Mellon as well as among the entire sector of higher education which dominates the country. Within a few years Carnegie-Mellon outlawed, among others things, "verbal conduct of a sexual nature where it has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile work environment." Translated into English, it was once perfectly safe to quote Casanova, but now it was seen as a form of anti-homosexual harassment.

A comment on this by *Reason*, the publication of the Cato Institute:

> Now Carnegie-Mellon places the need for the "free exchange of ideas" in as the need to promote "the intellectual development of all members of the community." Because the truly unfettered exercise of free speech can create a "hostile environment" that "deprives" a category of "historically disadvantaged" students of being able to participate in the life of the university, such speech must be restricted . . . . Equally significant, this protection is restricted by the explicit terms of university policy, to certain categories of "disadvantaged" students identified by sex, race, sexual orientation, and disability. This assault comes above all from the cultural left. . . . Indeed, the legal doctrine of free speech has focused crucially on the rights of revolutionaries, counter-culturalists, anti-war protesters, and generally, dissidents from Western capitalism. How is it then that today most vocal critics of the First Amendment are in the academy and on the left? They are, in fact, of the generation that years ago gave us the [mis-named] Berkeley Free Speech Movement.

It is not necessary here to list or describe the victimology of political correctness. Nation of Islam speakers can roam the uni-

versities attacking Jews and whites in terms that would have embarrassed Goebbels, with no unpleasant consequences; and an individual can almost lose his job because of protests from the bigoted that he used the word "niggardly" though it has no connection with the N-word which blacks use so casually among themselves. "Ofay" (from the pig Latin "foe") is not a proscribed word, nor is "honky," but "dinge" can bring in the law, as well as threats of mayhem. That great creator of the Rainbow Coalition, the Rev. Jesse Jackson, can speak of New York City as "Hymietown," and be quickly forgiven. But it cannot be noted without dire consequences that there are more blacks in prison for crimes that they clearly committed than whites for ditto. And that many blacks have volunteered in a color-blind armed services is seen as an indication of a racist conspiracy.

Is this all an accident, a cultural *malaise*? The answer to that goes directly to the Frankfurt School and to one of its Comintern polemicists, Herbert Marcuse. His influence on the generation which he led and included the afore-mentioned Abbie Hoffman, star-spangled britches and all, is often ascribed to Marcuse's book, *Eros & Civilization*—a diddle-me-this compilation of faux-intellectualism. But though *Eros* went into many editions, purchased by undergraduates who had studiously avoided Aristotle and Plato, the Marcuse product which really touched them was an essay, "Repressive Tolerance." In it, Marcuse sketched what was the basic dogma of Critical Theory, a rallying cry for political correctness. Going directly back to Marx and Rousseau, it struck at the doctrines that had congealed to form the American Constitution, the concepts of liberty and freedom, the delicate balance between minority and majority rights, the First Amendment, and academic freedom as it had been known until then.

Repressive Tolerance

"Repressive Tolerance" became the Ten Commandments of the repressive "academic speech codes" which it engendered. Marcuse argued in Orwellian newspeak that America's supposedly neutral tolerance for ideas was in reality a highly *selective* tolerance that benefited only the prevailing attitudes of those who held wealth and power. Such "indiscriminate" tolerance, he argued, effectively served "the cause of oppression" and the "established

machinery of discrimination." For Marcuse, as long as society was held captive by militarism and institutionalized, pervasive social and economic inequality,[42] "indiscriminate tolerance" necessarily would service the highly discriminatory interests of regression.

How were people to be freed from the bonds that kept them prisoners under a purely "illusory" tolerance? Marcuse responded that "they would have to get information slanted in the opposite direction , which cannot be accomplished within the established framework of abstract tolerance and spurious objectivity." He posited that there was a true and superior species which "enlarged the range and content of freedom." For Marcuse tolerance was moral and real only when harnessed to the cause of "liberation." A nominal freedom that allowed the expression of "false words and wrong deeds" to work against the attainment of " liberation" and of "true freedom and happiness" became an instrument for the "continuation of servitude." Marcuse's aims included the "withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups and movements which promote aggressive policies, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and religion or which opposes the extension of public services, social security, medical care." Etc.

For Marcuse "liberating" and "repressive tolerance," unlike "indiscriminate tolerance," would be "intolerance towards movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the Left no matter how repressive." He turned thumbs down on "sacred liberalistic" principles of equality for the "other side." "There are issues where there is no 'other 'side'." Calling for a trend which would reverse educational practice, he preached that the changes he advocated should "be enforced by the students and teachers themselves" and lead to "the systematic withdrawal of tolerance" towards liberals and the Right.[43] Marcuse himself had described what was behind "political correctness" when he disclosed his thinking on education, the thinking which led Abbie Hoffman, leader of the 1960s counterculture movement who had become one of Marcuse's most devoted followers, to describe it as "polymorphous perversity." Wrote Professor Marcuse: "One can rightfully speak of cultural revolution, since the protest is directed toward the whole cultural establishment, including the morality of existing society. . . . There is one thing we can say

with complete assurance. The traditional idea of revolution and the traditional strategy of revolution have ended. These ideas are old-fashioned . . . . What we must undertake is a type of diffuse and dispersed disintegration of the system."

In bringing about that "disintegration of the system," Marcuse had a rich and powerful ally: the United States Office of Education which, under pressure from the NEA, became the Department of Education. Controlled by the Frankfurt School, through Teachers College and the NEA, the Federal education system became an adjunct of the Institute and in time, with the funds which Congress supplied through grants to America's colleges and universities and through the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act" began actively pushing organized education into the miasma of Frankfurt School neo-Marxism-neo-Freudianism.

From the Office of Education, many of its official blissfully unaware of the source of what they were propagating, came the impetus to change the direction of American education. As has been noted, under such phony classifications as "diversity" and "multiculturalism," education in short ceased to impart knowledge. What had been taught in the schools, from the elementary to the graduate level, was dismissed as the product of "dead white males." Literature, philosophy, political science, history, mathematics, the sciences—the core and body of education from ancient times to the Twentieth Century— were shoved down the academic toilet. Reverse racism and sexism — anti-white and anti-male — became the order of the day.

By the 1960s, the Frankfurt scholars — Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, Lewin, Erich Fromm—the NEA, and the School's British associate, the Tavistock Institute, had achieved such overwhelming acceptance and dominion in the fields of clinical psychology, sociology, psychiatry, and educational theory that their movement to destroy Western civilization through the spread of "cultural pessimism" no longer had need of wide recruitment and deployment of conscious Comintern agents and dedicated neo-Marxists. It had become the Educational Establishment. The NEA, through Lewin's National Training Laboratories had introduced "group dynamics" into the training of teachers, guidance counselors, and education officials—and the U.S. Office of Education, seeking to

develop "innovative" approaches to public education, appealed to the Frankfurt School for guidance.

Mind Control

So encouraged, the academics set up projects and lectures. Dr. William Sargant, psychiatrist and a founder of England's neo-Marxist Tavistock Institute, was working with the CIA on a "mind control" project. In his book, *Battle for the Mind*, Sargant outlined some of the "findings" of the project, all stemming from the Frankfurt School, and these were incorporated into CIA policy. "Various types of belief can be implanted in many people, after brain function has been sufficiently disturbed by accidentally or deliberately infused fear, anger or excitement. Of the results caused by such disturbances, the most common is impaired judgment and heightening suggestibility. Its various group manifestations appear most spectacularly in periods of common danger, which increase anxiety and so to individual and mass suggestibility."

Aldous Huxley, a Tavistock associate and Frankfurt School collaborator, worked on a covert Pentagon and CIA project on the uses of drugs. Lecturing at the California Medical School in San Francisco under the auspices of the State Department, Huxley did academic propaganda for the views of the Frankfurt School:

> It seems to me perfectly in the cards that a euphoric drug far more efficient and less harmful than alcohol may be produced, and this should be made available, and should be introduced into every bottle of Coca Cola .... [T]his could become an incredibly powerful instrument in the hands of a dictator. What is becoming quite clear now is that the dictatorships of the future probably will not be based on terror, as the dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin. Terror is an extremely wasteful, stupid, and inefficient method of controlling people ....
>
> There will be in the next generation or so a pharmacological method of making people love their servitude and producing dictatorship without tears—producing a kind of painless concentration camp for entire societies so that people will in fact have their liberties taken away from them but will enjoy it because they will be distracted from any desire to rebel—by propaganda, or brainwashing enhanced by pharmacological methods. And this seems to be the final revolution.

It is a matter of record that the Frankfurt School, through its invasion of education and the work of Herbert Marcuse, the "revolutionists" of the New Left, and the counterculture brigades of the New Left, were already encouraging the "educational" use of drugs. The Frankfurt School itself was working on brainwashing and propaganda techniques—with drugs very much on its agenda. Academia also had them on its mind. Harvard set up a Psychedelic Drug Project, of which Aldous Huxley and drug-saturated Dr. Timothy Leary were major participants. In *Flashback*, Leary's autobiographical account of the Harvard project, he recounts a conversation with Huxley:

> Suddenly, Aldous clapped his hands against his bony leg. "Your role is quite simple. Become a cheerleader for evolution. That's what I did and my grandfather before me. These brain-drugs, massed-produced in the laboratories, will bring about vast changes in society. This will happen without you or me. All we can do is spread the word. The obstacle to this evolution is the Bible. We had run against the Judeo-Christian commitment to one God, one religion, one reality that has cursed Europe for centuries and America since its founding days. Drugs that open the mind to multiple realities inevitably lead to a polytheistic view of the universe. We sensed that the time for a new humanist religion based on intelligence, good-natured pluralism and scientific paganism had arrived.

What has not been detailed of this curriculum except in the Aesopian language of the many pro-Institute writings is the why and wherefore, adumbrated within the accounts of the activities of Herbert Marcuse (after he had returned to academia from OSS and the State Department) where, from Brandeis University which he almost destroyed, he took over the leadership of "cultural" Marxism and the New Left.

★ ★ ★

[15]

The Institute: Marcuse & "Critical Activism"

In *The Frankfurt School*, the lavish official history of the Institute for Social Research, Rolf Wiggershaus singles out as the key men of the Frankfurt School Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse. Horkheimer was the least significant in ideological contributions and the *gestalt* of those who made up the Institute. He was its manager, its publicist, its fund-raiser, and its major liaison with the Comintern and his efforts were directed more towards keeping the Institute alive and with sufficient funds to provide him and his favorites with a very comfortable existence. Adorno was its academic strong-arm. Marcuse harked back to the virulence of Marx's hates and passions. He was the guru of political correctness, of campus blackmail and violence, and of the propaganda and indoctrination which was voiced by his disciples, Abbie Hoffman and Communist Party leader Angela Davis.

In short, where Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, and others believed in the poisoned ideological pill, Marcuse combined it with the bloody ax-handle. In 1932, when Horkheimer was holding Adorno off from official membership in the Institute (Adorno had a family fortune behind him) , he accepted Marcuse, despite Marcuse's association with Nazi-to-be Martin Heidegger. For this, Marcuse remained a Horkheimer "loyalist" when the battle for funds convulsed the Frankfurt School, in the post-World War II era, with the Comintern, now completely underground and absorbed

by the Soviet secret services, siphoning off the funds which first Willi Muenzenberger and then his NKVD successor, Otto Katz, had sent to the Frankfurt School and its allies. The seeds had been well planted by the Institute in the Education Establishment and in communications; the billionaire liberal foundations had been successfully invaded or won over.

Herbert Marcuse had moved with the Institute from Frankfurt to Geneva to New York (with a small stop in Paris at Muezenburg headquarters at 83 Boulevard Montparnasse) and basked in the School's standing at Columbia University and Teachers College. Like other Frankfurters, he had gotten American citizenship, suffering no qualms about his oath denying adherence to the Comintern. This had permitted him, as we have seen, along with other Frankfurters, to enter the sensitive and secret realm of American wartime policy and operations—the Office of Strategic Services.

With the end of hostilities in the European Theater of Operations, Marcuse and other of his Institute colleagues worked mightily and feverishly to guide John McCloy, General Lucius Clay and the American occupation forces to close their doors to conservative and liberal anti-Communist-anti-Nazi groups and individuals. This work continued when OSS was dumped on the State Department. Marcuse went along happily, but he was not suffered gladly by the Department's bureaucrats—not for his ideology but for his arrogance and his accent.

Back To Academia

In disgruntlement, Marcuse left the State Department and returned to the groves of academia. Moving through Columbia, Harvard, and Yale, he lodged between 1954 and 1965 at Brandeis University where he was Professor of Politics and Philosophy and attained the status of neo-Marxist and revolutionary guru. Presumably he was teaching the dialectics of Hegel and Marx, though in fact he was preaching the sexual extremism of Wilhelm Reich, the neo-Freudianism of Erich Fromm, and the neo-Marxism of the School, with the added spice of calls to harsh intolerance and violence. The falsity of his rhetoric becomes startlingly obvious when one considers some remarks he made during the 1960s when he shared a platform with Stokely ("Burn, Baby, Burn") Carmichael: "We are dealing with the dialectics of liberation, and not only lib-

eration in an intellectual sense, but liberation involving the mind and body, liberation involving entire human existence." Now dialectics has a specific meaning, both in Aristotle and Hegel. In classical dialectics, there is the *thesis,* which confronts the *antithesis,* and from their conflict comes a *synthesis,* a form of compromise or ideological adulteration. Critical Theory rejected both classical and Hegelian dialectic.

At Brandeis, Marcuse became the inspirational and the *sub rosa* organizational leader of the New Left and the so-called student rebellion. The Weather Underground, an important terrorist group, grew out of a New York East Side drug cult, Up Against the Wall, Motherfuckers, led by Marcuse's stepson and funded by the Ford Foundation on Marcuse's recommendation. Students for a Democratic Society became an important factor in the New Left and in the creation of the drug-propelled counterculture. Marcuse was a mentor to the Black Panthers. And among Marcuse's dedicated followers were Brandeis students like Abbie Hoffman, who demonstrated his zeal by sewing an American flag to the seat of his pants and CP official Angela Davis, a leader of the Black Power movement.

In her autobiography, Davis describes Marcuse at work:

> When Marcuse walked onto the platform his presence dominated everything. There was something imposing about him that evoked total silence and attention when he appeared, without his having to pronounce a single word. The students had a rare respect for him. . . . With his frequent denunciations of the trivial or fashionable products of a sterile climate of "academic boredom" and his insistence that genuine thought is normative, negative, and "transcendent," students found him a uniquely provocative teacher, and in his outspoken positions on the Cuban missile crisis, the Civil Rights drive in the South, support of the Brazilian military coup of 1964, the growing intervention in Southeast Asia, and the emerging political movements of the early 1960s found him an ally and, let it be said, an inspiration.

Marcuse's lectures were a surging attack on liberalism and democracy as totalitarianism, bridging the gap between the Frankfurt School's Critical Theory and the praxis—practical as opposed

to theoretical application of rules—of the New Left's insurgency and cultural shifts. But his major stock-in-trade and his appeal to students both at Brandeis and nationwide, was his call for a double-standard left-wing intolerance and assault on anyone who did not agree.. Of Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization,* Abbie Hoffman, Brandeis Class of '59 and Yippie leader, would say that "while all his contemporaries were scolding the young for their excesses in politics, sex, and drugs, Marcuse alone cheered us on."[44]

Eros and Civilization has been described as having brought back the Frankfurt School's "revolutionary messianism" of the Georg Lukacs days, and adumbrates the School's ideology of *kulturpessimismus.* Freud's theory held that civilization was not possible without restraint of instinctual eroticism. Marcuse argued that society should function without any restraints on Eros of any kind, that it was societal repression of unfettered sex from infancy on which caused capitalist inequalities, wars, totalitarianism, and all the evils of modern life. The Frankfurters had for the most part rejected such aspects of Freud's dogma as the Oedipus complex. Marcuse held that to Freud the Oedipal wish, as Martin Jay put it in *The Dialectical Imagination,* a neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian primer, "was not merely a protest against separation from the child's mother and the painful alienation of freedom it signified. It also expressed a profound craving for sexual gratification, for freedom from want, for the mother as woman, not merely as protectress."

In fact, Marcuse argued that "it is first the 'sexual craving' for the mother-woman that threatens the psychical basis of civilization; it is the 'sexual craving' that makes the Oedipus conflict the prototype of the instinctual conflicts between the individual and his society." The Oedipal wish to kill the father, Marcuse translated into the wish to destroy a patriarchal society, the justification for the Critical Theorist's attack on the family, marriage, and religion. It was *Eros and Civilization,* along with Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* which led Lucien Goldmann, a French radical and visiting professor at Columbia to say of Marcuse that "the [violent] student movements found in his works . . . the theoretical formulation of their problems and aspirations."

It was far more than his "theoretical formulations" which were at work. His ideas and his strategies were, as one writer put it, "permanently ensconced in the collective psyche of Brandeis"

and lived on to plague what had been a first-class university before he employed it as the base for his youth operations.[45] The record of violence, intimidation by student groups of faculty and administration, and the plunge in academic standards are all on the record. But Marcuse's encouragement went beyond the ideological and the rhetorical, to the actual operational. Who he was aiding has been rehearsed at length in the newspapers and in books, both pro and con. But the political aspects and consequences, and the ability of the New Left perpetrators to turn the heat away from themselves, is soberly told in a confidential memo from a late 1970s highly confidential government source.

> During the Vietnam War, the most visible group of protesters was known as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). . . . Demonstrators became increasingly aggressive and violence often entered the picture . . . Leaders of the Weatherman Group were Bernardine Dohrn, Mark Rudd and Kathy Boudin. During this time, Fidel Castro entered the picture [by involving Cuba in Weatherman activities]. Those who were susceptible were taught Communism and revolutionary violence.
>
> As the Weatherman group turned more and more to violence, the disenchanted drifted away. The hard core which remained quickly became violent young radicals who bragged that they were "Communist revolutionaries" and that the United States government must be brought down by force. The official Weatherman publication is called Osawatomie [and is filled with] hate and defiance for the United States.
>
> The Weatherman group became vicious criminals who arrogantly claimed credit for hundreds of bombings. and other acts of violence—bombing the U.S. Capitol, the 'Pentagon, and the State Department. FBI actions against Arab terrorists were met with acclaim but not all view the arrest of Weatherman bombers with approval. Youthful lawyers in the Justice Department, still nursing resentment against the FBI because it would not "bend the law" in the crusade for civil rights . . . . pounced on the Weatherman cases. They view the surreptitious entries as civil rights violations. Identical actions to prevent Arab terrorism are conveniently overlooked.
>
> The Civil Rights Division began a massive grand jury investigation using a technique called "sequential indictments" which was

simply to threaten prosecution of FBI agents who would not testify against higher-ups. This grossly un-American form of prosecutorial arm-twisting worked effectively over one hundred agents. Leaks to the media from Justice prosecutors have resulted in widespread publicity that current targets of the investigation are former Acting Director L. Patrick Gray III, former Associate Director W. Mark Felt and Edward S. Miller, former Assistant Director in charge of the Domestic Intelligence Division which was directly responsible for supervision of the Weatherman cases.[46]

Marcuse, of course had other arrows in his quiver, and other constituencies—and his views on them began to resound particularly after he had left Brandeis for the University of California-San Diego. Betty Friedan had launched "women's liberation" in much the same agit-prop spirit that Willi Muenzenberg had launched hundreds of transmission belt movements. Marcuse thought more in terms of Critical Theory ideology —anti-patriarchal, anti-family, anti-male, anti-heterosexual, anti-Judeo-Christian civilization. In *Herbert Marcuse: The Art of Liberation,* Barry Katz touches on this, though very lightly: "The probing of the possible ground of reconciliation which occupied Marcuse . . . . went beyond a political endorsement of women's liberation and beyond the superficially Marxist view that the alleviation of sexual oppression would be 'the mere by-product of new social institutions'."

He did not like the term "women's liberation" because the movement should go "beneath and beyond the male-female dichotomy." Nevertheless he argued that a separate women's movement "is not only justified but necessary." What he called for was a "new sensibility" which would establish that the qualities which are now held to be "feminine" were so because of a patriarchal capitalist society which had relegated women to the home, and that men and women were psychologically and societally alike.

But Marcuse did not only ride side-saddle with the radical feminists. What better way than to employ those who no longer subscribed to classical Marxism but still retained their hatred of Judeo-Christian morality and Western society than to give them a new destructive cause: environmentalism. The environmentalist movement directed at free enterprise, at land use, at productivity, and at emplòyment. Under the Environmental Protection

Agency, government struck at the orderly process of industry and business, small and large, dictatorially bringing disruption and often bankruptcy to their economy, fitting in perfectly with the aims of the Critical Theorists who sought not only a moral but an economic breakdown of the West. It is significant that Marcuse founded the Green Party—quickly compared to a watermelon, green on the outside, red on the inside—in West Germany and aided its trans-Atlantic move to the United States, where it eventually became a factor in national politics, even to running Ralph Nader for President.

The Institute for Social Research moved back to Germany after the war, where it worked closely with General Clay's American Military Government operation, preparing dossiers of conservative and centrist non- and anti-Nazis who had survived the Hitler purges, hoping to blackball them , and recommending Communists and left-socialists for roles in the postwar regime. By the mid-1960s, the capitals of Europe were seething with student/worker insurgencies and protest movements, and Marcuse was in the thick of it. In July of 1967, he was in London as a speaker and participant in a "Congress on the Dialectics of Liberation" sponsored by the Frankfurt School and its ideological mate, the Tavistock Institute. In 1968 during student-worker riots, he was in Paris, cheering them on and speaking at a UNESCO seminar on "The Role of Karl Marx in the Development of Contemporary Scientific Thought"—as part of the UN's celebration of the 150 anniversary of Marx's birth. From Paris, he flew to Berlin, to give support to student revolutionists. And he toured Oslo, Amsterdam, Salzburg, and other major European cities, exhorting to revolution. When he reached Rome, student protesters held up signs: "Marx, Mao, and Marcuse." *Eros & Civilization* had practically become a college textbook, and *One-Dimensional Man*, sold 100,000 copies in its English edition and was translated into sixteen languages.

★ ★ ★

[16]

From Fromm to the Invasion of Communications

In its American period, after Edward R. Murrow through his committee to transplant displaced Marxist scholars had set up colonies of them in the academic establishment, the Frankfurt School began a period of prosperity. Otto Katz, the Comintern-NKVD representative and secret overseer of the Institute (much of the time illegally commuting from Mexico), had planted Kurt Weill, Bertold Brecht, Hanns Eisler, and others in Hollywood, where they became part of the West Coast underground. The cash-flow from the film capital passed through the hands of Otto Katz and to the Comintern, but some of it went to Horkheimer and the Institute at Columbia and where needed to other operations such as to the Lillian Hellman-Dashiell Hammett team and the newspaper *PM* , augmenting what came from bemused capitalists.

Herbert Marcuse was the Frankfurt School's most active of activist. Theodor Adorno was polluting aesthetics and culture, preparatory to his great work of libeling the American psyche in the Rockefeller Foundation-financed study, *The Authoritarian Personality*. Horkheimer worked assiduously as impresario and treasurer of the School's operations. But of these operations, among the most successful, though not gaudily showy, was the work of Erich Fromm and the Institute's Radio Project.

In 1937, the *Columbia Review,* the college's literary magazine,

published a group of limericks, one of which poked fun at Freudians on the college and university faculty:

> An erotic neurotic named Sid
> Got his ego mixed up with his id,
> His errant libido
> Was like a torpedo,
> And that's why he done what he did.

It might have been written to lampoon everyone from Sigmund Freud to Erich Fromm, in typical undergraduate fashion. Fromm was different, however. Unlike others of the Frankfurt School—the Horkheimers, Lowenthals, Pollocks, and his other passionately anti-Semitic Jewish colleagues—Fromm had never employed psychoanalysis to denigrate his Jewish origins or Judaism itself. This mightily irked Theodor Adorno, who had dropped his Weisengrund patronymic, and who referred to Fromm as "a professional Jew" and sought continually to banish him from the Institute.

Fromm was born in 1900 in Frankfurt am Main, the only child of Orthodox Jewish parents who both came from a family of rabbis and Talmudists; his father was a successful merchant. Fromm studied sociology, philosophy and psychology for two semesters at Frankfurt University, but moved on to Heidelberg where his doctoral dissertation in 1919 was on "Jewish Law, A Contribution to the Jewish Diaspora." In the following years, he taught at the Free Jewish School, in Frankfurt, seeking to combine Talmudic doctrine with secular humanism. In the mid-1920s, he learned about psychoanalysis from Frieda Reichmann, founder of a private psychoanalytic sanitarium which became known as the "Torah-peutic Clinic."

Fromm trained as a psychoanalyst, married Frieda, and began to practice in 1927, when he also published *Der Sabat*. In that essay, he argued Oedipiously that, as Rolf Wiggershaus put it, "the Sabbath originally served as a reminder of the killing of the father and the winning of the mother; the commandment not to work served as a penance for original sin and for its repetition through regression to the pre-genital stage." By 1929, however, he had abandoned his efforts to meld Jewish Orthodoxy and so-

cialism, though he never attacked his natal faith. Along with left Freudians such as Wilhelm Reich, he began the ideological trek to a synthesis of Freudianism and Cultural Marxism, which eventually wove together the neo-Freudian and neo-Marxist strands of Critical Theory. The opening in Frankfurt of an Institute of Psychoanalysis of which Fromm was a founder and lecturer—the Institute for Social Research gave it house room in its quarters at the University— brought Fromm in contact with Horkheimer and the other developing Critical Theorist, and he doubled in brass as a lecturer at the Frankfurt School. His lecture at the formal opening of the Psychoanalytical Institute, "The Application of Psychoanalysis to Sociology and Religious Studies" ran a double-track course.

Marxist Psychology

For some years, Fromm's combination of orthodox psychoanalysis and orthodox Marxism was seen approvingly by Marcuse and Reich as "radical Marxist social psychology." In his writings of that period, Fromm noted that conditions, for example the oppression of the lower classes, were responsible for concepts, religions, and world views. His Marxist interpretation of Freud's ideas led to an explanation of the permanence of class societies which logically implied that their injustices were permanent. Contrary to the precepts of the early Marx and the neo-Marxists which held that patriarchy was analogous to individual compulsive neurotic symptoms, Fromm preached the abandonment of

> . . . attitudes opposed to the father and as the outcome of a centuries-long process of adaptation which did not affect the totality of individual psychological structures, but only a sector which was common to everyone. It was a process of adaptation to the existing real social situation, in which any hopes of a collapse of the ruling class and a victory of their own class were so out of the question that it would have been pointless and uneconomical, from the psychic point of view, to persist in the attitude of hate. . . . Religions could not be reduced to pathological analogy with psycho analytical individual psychology, but had to be seen as the collective fantasies of "normal" people—that is, human beings on whose psychic situation reality has an incomparably greater influence than on

> those who are "neurotic." . . The real infantile situation of childhood, which neurotic individuals are fixated on in one form or another, comes to an end at some point. A thorough elimination of the illness was therefore possible, and there was some purpose in helping the patient. Class society, however . . . was a lasting reality against which rebellion was understandable, but it was in no way more rational than psychic acceptance of it . . . . For this reason, rebellion did not deserve to be supported.

Paradoxically, Fromm proceeded from this point to the position that economic factors exclusively determined the conditions of life—in contradiction to the preceding views. Psychoanalysis, he argued, offered the means for taking "the path which leads from economic determinism through the human heart and mind and right on to an ideological conclusion." In his 1939 essay on "Politics and Psychoanalysis," he wrote: "Psychoanalysis will assist sociology significantly here, since the coherence and stability is not merely formed and guaranteed by mechanical or rational factors (compulsion by the authority of the state, shared self-interest, etc.) but also by a series of libidinous relations within society, and in particular between members of the various different classes (cf. the infantile ties which link the petty bourgeoisie with the ruling class, and the intellectual intimidation resulting from this)."

Having stated his allegiance to neo-Freudianism, Fromm now gave it all back to Marxism when he argued that the economy was the arbiter of man's fate. "The quasi-neurotic behavior of the masses," he held, "which is an appropriate response to the damaging and pointless conditions of life they are inevitably faced with, cannot, therefore, be healed by analysis. It will only be healed by the *alteration and elimination of these conditions of life.*" [Author's emphasis.] But as Fromm's development continued, he came more and more in conflict with cultural Marxism and even the neo-Freudianism of the Frankfurt School, and he moved on a parallel course to that of the "neo-analyst" Karen Horney, whose influential writings combined psychiatry and psychoanalysis with sociology and ethnology.

In 1942, Fromm published *Escape From Freedom*, a book written for both the psycho-sociological trade and for a lay audience,

which gave him preeminence in his field and sold widely. To Fromm, the main theme of this book was "that man, the more he gains freedom in emerging from the original oneness with man and nature and the more he becomes an 'individual' has no choice but to unite himself to the world in . . . love and productive work, or else seek a kind of security by such ties as destroy his freedom and the integrity of his individual self." Neurosis was not the creature of ruthless and patriarchal society. Sadism and masochism were not, as Freud would have had it, sexual and erotic, but to Fromm were efforts to escape overwhelming feelings of isolation and social impotence. The need for "symbiosis" with others were factors in the developing absence of individuality in the merging of the self with repressive society.

He perceived psychoanalytical change optimistically, as opposed to the negativism of Critical Theory, in moralistic terms. "Every neurosis represents a moral problem. The failure to achieve maturity and integration of the whole personality is a moral problem," he wrote in a later book. And in response to criticism from the Frankfurt School, he would write that "only exceptionally can one find, as I have pointed out in *The Art of Loving,* that there is love in a society whose principle is the very opposite. He denied Freud's concepts of instinctivism and the death wish. And he posited that sexual repression and Puritanism were anti-social but negated the total sexual unrestraint and promiscuity, the "polymorphous perversity" advocated by Marcuse.

His gift to feminism was the negation of Freud's assessment that women's inferior position in society was due to physical and psychic differences with men. Instead, Fromm argued, those differences were the result of society's patriarchal and economic basis, which forced women to seek the protection of the male. But his greatest gift to the Frankfurt School was in retaining and expanding Freud's theories of the unconscious. According to this, a person's words, acts, attitudes, and personal history were no proof that buried in his unconscious there was not an authoritarian, fascist, racist, anti-Semitic, anal personality. The witch-hunters of old societies had believed this, and it had become an integral part of the Nazi and Soviet jurisprudence which justified Stalin's purges and Hitler's concentration camps. It was to be the shameful logic behind the Frankfurt School's perverse study, *The*

Authoritarian Personality, in which Critical Theorist anti-Semites presumably sought to employ the anti-Semitic Marx and Freud to cast the suspicion of anti-Semitism on all Christian and non-Jewish Americans. Presumably, its clear aim was to measure adherence to the beliefs of Western Judeo-Christian culture and civilization, in order to characterize them and discredit them as "fascist" or "authoritarian." Significantly, the study disregarded adherence to Communist belief as not indicative of authoritarianism and/or anti-Semitism, since (or so it averred) at the time (Stalin's most murderous campaign against the Jews), Russia was "the only country where there is not anti-Semitism."

What has been touted as Erich Fromm's greatest and final work, *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness,* once more led him into support of the Frankfurt School's tenets. Drawing from Freud's theories of the life and the death instincts, he arrived at the conclusion that the psychiatric maladies, the neuroses and psychoses of contemporary "bourgeois" society's politico-economic bases were characterized by necrophilia. This he defined thusly:

> *Necrophilia in the characterological sense can be described as the passionate attraction to all that is dead, decayed, putrid, sickly; it is the passion to transform that which is alive into something unalive; to destroy for the sake of destruction; the exclusive interest in all that is purely mechanical. It is the passion to tear apart living structures.* [Fromm's emphasis.]
>
> A very intelligent, erudite, necrophilious person—he will tend to dress in dark, drab colors—may talk about things that would be very interesting were it not in the way he presents his ideas. He remains stiff, cold, aloof; his presentation of the subject is pedantic and lifeless. On the other hand, the opposite character type, the biophilious life-loving person, may talk of an experience that in itself is not particularly interesting but there is life in the way he presents it; he is stimulating.

Another dimension of the necrophilious is the attitude toward the past and property. "What has been, i.e., what is dead, rules his life: institutions, laws, property, traditions, and possessions. *Having* rules *being*. . . . In the necrophile's thinking—personal, philosophical, and political. . . . drastic change is a crime against the "natural" order. And he carries this over to Marxism, in a pregnant footnote:

"For Marx, capital and labor were not merely two economic categories. Capitalism for him was the manifestation of the past, of labor transformed and amassed into things; labor was the manifestation of *life*, of human energy applied to nature in the process of transforming it. The choice between capital and labor amounted to this: What is dead over what is alive, or what is alive over what is dead."

The political nature of Fromm's attitudes and theories emerge in an "interpretive questionnaire" designed by himself and by fellow researcher Michael Maccoby to isolate those deemed to be necrophiliac and "anal." The study asked questions that "permitted correlating political opinions to character" and necrophilia, and Fromm quotes from Maccoby's evaluation of the survey: "In all of the samples," declared Maccoby, "we found that anti-life tendencies were significantly correlated to political positions that supported increased military power and favored repression of dissenters." Fromm did not note here that this would include in his evaluation the Soviet Union, Communist China, North Korea, Cuba, and all the socialist-oriented dictatorships of Latin American, Africa, and Asia. The Frankfurt School temperament does not indulge in such exercises. And these conclusions follow:

> The following priorities were considered most important by individuals who have dominant anti-life tendencies: tighter control of rioters, tighter enforcement of drug laws, winning the war in Vietnam, controlling subversive groups, strengthening the police, and fighting Communism throughout the world.

But there are other symptoms of necrophilia and capitalist corruption: Men "who feel more tender towards their automobiles than their wives; tourists who take too many pictures on their travels; the person who is intent on replacing every application of human effort with a 'work saving' contraption;" the inventor. The necrophilious quality of these phenomena becomes more visible if we examine the direct evidence of the fusion of technique and destructiveness of which our epoch finds so many examples. . . . the overt connection between destruction and the worship of technique." And what are among the essential elements of necrophilia? "Worship of speed and the machine; poetry as a means of attack; glorification of war; destruction of culture,

locomotives and planes as living forces, political hatreds, and constipation." And, as the necrophiliac product of a "fully developed capitalism" Fromm creates the "marketing character" for whom "everything is developed into a commodity."

The Frankfurt School, though not re-hugging Erich Fromm to its bosom, rejoiced in *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, not realizing that many of his list of analyses of necrophilia applied directly to Critical Theory.

Erich Fromm both gave and took away from the mythology and the ideology of the Frankfurt School, and contributed to the thrust and methodology of its so-called *Studies in Prejudice*. But the Institute for Social Research had another and very important agenda—namely a parallel means for the corruption of Western civilization. It both learned from and taught publicist and Frankfurt School fellow-traveler Eric Bernays the lessons of mass cultural manipulation, and he recited them in his book, *Propaganda*. It is a textbook in media manipulation and brainwashing, deserving considerable citation. His very first paragraphs tell a tale which is considerably elaborated:

> The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habit and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, largely by men we have never heard of. . . . It remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world:
>
> It is chiefly the psychologists of the school of Freud who have pointed that many of man's thoughts and actions are compensatory substitutes for desires which he has been obliged to suppress [in his unconscious]. . . . This general principle, that men are very largely actuated by motives which they conceal from themselves, is as true of mass as of individual psychology.
>
> The radio is at present [this was written before TV became

> the most powerful medium] one of the most powerful tools of the propagandist. . . . The American motion picture is the greatest unconscious carrier of propaganda in the world today. It is a great distributor for ideas and opinions.

The Radio Research Project

The Frankfurt School did not need Eric Bernays's remarks on propaganda. In Germany, it had brought the art and entertainment world into its periphery. In letters, Thomas Mann supported the Institute, with Franz Kafka's nightmares sustaining it, as the bi-sexual Marlene Dietrich had done in Berlin, as she frolicked with Otto Katz, then a rising Comintern agent. Propagandistically and of far greater significance was the Institute's inauguration of what became known as the Princeton Radio Project, which was entrusted to Paul Lazarsfeld, a research associate with the Frankfurt School since its German period.

Born in Vienna in 1901, Paul Lazarsfeld grew up in an ambiance of socialism, psychoanalysis and radical feminism. His mother, Sophie Lazarsfeld, had studied under the post-Freudian Alfred Adler. She was a practicing psychoanalyst and had written a number of fighting books on women's liberation. Paul's first profession was that of a mathematics teacher. He gave that up to become an assistant to Charlotte Buehler, a founder of the Psychological Institute at Vienna University. In 1927, he founded the Economic and Psychological Research Group, within the Psychological Institute. The Group contracted to do the first Austrian market research and a study for the Austrian Broadcasting Company of listeners preferences. A long collaboration with Lazarsfeld began when the Frankfurt School contracted the Group to conduct an inquiry among young workers in Austria. In 1930, he began a study of *The Unemployed of Marienthal*, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, which in 1933 granted him a fellowship to work in the United States. He would not return to Vienna for many years.

When his tenure with the Foundation ended, he was appointed, at the recommendation of Professor Robert Lynd, to a post with the New Deal's National Youth Administration at the University of Newark where he also taught some courses and be-

came director of a social research group. The Institute came to Lazarsfeld's financial aid by contracting to have the Newark group do some of its work and paying its staff for supervisory duties. Lazarsfeld's earliest collaboration was on the inquiries and analyses for the Frankfurt School's *Studies on Authority and the Family,* a major Critical Theorist anti-family project in which Lazarsfeld's participation was considered "essential." Cooperation became close when Lazarsfeld and his assistant Herta Herzog advised the Institute on matters of methodology and the use of data. He also developed a common strategy with Horkheimer in raising money for their joint operation, and as a kind of advance man for Critical Theory in the academic establishment.

Because of his connection with the Institute, Lazarsfeld was asked by the Rockefeller Foundation to head a comprehensive radio research project, the Office of Radio Research, more commonly known as the Princeton Radio Research Project. It later moved to Columbia University as the Bureau of Applied Social Research at the passionate behest of extreme-Marxist Professor Robert Lynd, where it would be closer to the Frankfurt School. The transfer strengthened its aims: to determine sociologically the appeal of radio and to manipulate that appeal to further the aims of neo-Marxism-neo Freudianism by the use of ideological brainwashing. The Radio Project would, over the years of its existence, work closely with anti-anti-Communist organizations such as the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, the Rev. Leon Birkhead's Friends of Democracy, etc. most of which were being financed by William (Intrepid) Stephenson and British Intelligence to draw the U.S. into World War II.

Though not organizationally involved with the Frankfurt School, the Radio Project was tied to it through Lazarsfeld's association and his ideologically loyalties, and was basically under its direction. Among the first he brought in was Theodor Adorno to handle the research and evaluation of music on the airwaves. This, however, was a mistake. Adorno typically antagonized everyone he worked with, and he was eventually dropped on the insistence of the project's financial sponsors.[47] Lazarsfeld also brought into the project two Princeton sociologists, Haley Cantril and Gordon Allport; Critical Theorist Herta Herzog Lazarsfeld, who later became director of research for the Voice of America;

and most important of all, Frank Stanton, a real catch. Stanton was then research director for the Columbia Broadcasting System, later to become president of the CBS News division; head of the network; chairman of the board of the RAND corporation, a semi-governmental think tank; and a member of President Johnson's "kitchen cabinet." Funneling his own researches into the "radio project" was Institute ambassador Kurt Lewin, and there was co-operation from the other major networks.

Ostensibly, the purpose of the "radio project" was to determine what the impact of radio programming was, why there were more radio sets than telephones in the U.S., and who listened to radio. It was discovered that women at the higher socio-economic level were more addicted to soap opera than the low-income housewife; that it was not the message but the format that was important; and that among what the project considered the great unwashed, easily digested radio news was preferred to the printed page. This psychological measurement of public attitudes, and the belief in public irrationality, could be used as a tool to indoctrinate listeners in what communications managers considered proper patterns of thought and action and the management of politics by "experts." When Lazarsfeld continued as director of what was now given the more honest name of Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia, he was expected by the university to train students in what was politely called "empirical methods."

The music section, under Theodor Adorno, nearly led the Rockefeller Foundation to withdraw its support of the project.[48] Adorno argued that the broadcast of "serious" music was an abomination to all but professional musicians. The foolish broadcasters, moreover, were not in tune with his musical tastes, which ran to the atonalist and twelve-tone scale post-moderns, and in radio broadcasts they committed the sin of playing both the classics and the avant-garde on the same programs. Adorno in his reports called for the "liquidation" of all reproduced musical sound. He also launched a continuing attack on jazz, which he saw as the product of capitalist aggression against Marxism and the working class. The jazz fan, he declared, was being "masochistically subjected to an authoritarian collective." So extreme were his theories and his attacks on the broadcasting industry that Lazarsfeld felt compelled to write to Adorno: "You attack other people as fetish-

ist, neurotic, and sloppy, but you show in yourself the very same traits very clearly."

The Project's work was reinforced by the studies of political scientists like Charles Merriam of "measurable" and "controllable" political reactions. He called on psychiatrists and physiologists to "build the citizen from the ground up." In short, to shape the citizenry with a psychological cookie-cutter, eliminating what he considered harmful differences in public opinion and creating beneficent social cohesiveness. The Project's study of radio and its audience was directed towards the development of a methodology for media brainwashing. As J. Michael Sproule notes in his heavily liberal *Propaganda and Democracy,* "The dedication of Lazarsfeld to large-scale quantitative data collection fit the move of grantors, particularly the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, to underwrite innovative scientific social research . . . The term *science* was key; Lazarsfeld's work on a communication-managed society was attractive . . . . because the resulting data accommodated the wish of grantors to serve society. The broad theorizing of the Frankfurt School intrigued leading social scientists like Lazarsfeld."

The ties between data research and broadcast policy were openly established by the work of the Radio Project, and clearly indicated in Lazarsfeld's "gratificatification" studies for CBS, now a client and almost an associate of the Institute, and in Haley Cantril's researches for supporting his "efforts" to demonstrate the need for government radio to counter Axis propaganda in Latin America . . . From the then-War Department to the White House, Washington policy makers understood that research data could facilitate policy implementation, and at the same time enhance public acquiescence. Academicians began to accept that the best opportunities for social science generally and communication science particularly, lay in forging alliances between researchers and policy makers."

"Persuasion Science"

Eventually, Karl Lewin's studies and writings contributed to the growing literature on communications as they affected what was seen as the battle between "authoritarianism" (i.e., free enterprise) and "democracy" (i.e., neo-Marxism). "Persuasion science"

was the in-thing among communicators, as the country moved from what at the start of the Radio Age had been the aim of objectivity to the blatantly propagandistic Television Age. As long as the trend was pro-Soviet, it received the ardent support of I.F. Stone's *Weekly*, a publication in time subsidized by the NKVD. Further support came from the Army's Special Operations Research Office, which gave the largest single grant to something coyly named Operation Camelot, which provided communications data both to the Pentagon and to Chilean Marxist revolutionists.

The Frankfurt School's Radio Project was directed towards bringing about public docility to government. In fact, it served to infiltrate the neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian program of the Frankfurt School to radio, and to a far greater extent to TV, the most persuasive of the communications media, as President Lyndon Johnson discovered when the New Left was given status in its attacks on him, on the Vietnam war, and on non-Marxist education. Without the injection of this ideology, and the prominence given to it by radio, TV, and films, the history of the period from the 1960s to date, particularly the destruction of the nation's educational base, would have been different. The neo-Marxists in the Institute and their followers in the National Education Association had advocated sexual license, homosexuality, mindless violence, total amorality, and elimination of the family and of religion, and now these were imbued in the social pattern, with the help of TV's political and cultural bias.

By 1971, S. I. Hayakawa, then president of San Francisco College, expert on the power and shading of language, and later a U.S. Senator, would write for newspaper syndication, *Brainwashing by the Networks.* It was based on a book, *The News Twisters* by Edith Efron, a writer for the mass-circulation *TV Guide.* Her book was the result of taping all evening TV news programs on CBS, NBC, and ABC, then the only networks, from 16 September to 4 November 1968. Wrote Dr. Hayakawa:

> From the transcriptions of the broadcasts, [Miss Efron] analyzed the coverage given to the three presidential candidates of 1968, and to a set of ten related issues such as U.S. policy on the Vietnam war, black militants, radical violence, and the white middle class.

"From the resultant body of about 100,00 words per network," Miss Efron writes, "I isolated all stories dealing with the chosen issues—and excerpted all 'for' and 'against' opinion. . . . Network news is an extremely non-intellectual commodity, and the opinion which it relays tends to be simple, short, highly partisan, and crudely 'for' and 'against'. It is readily isolated. . . . When all such opinion was isolated and filed, I then counted the number of words of opinion 'for' and 'against' on each issue."

The statistics are indeed startling. Here is Miss Efron's summary of the number of [words spoken] about Richard Nixon during [that period of] the campaign: on ABC, for 869, against 1793; on CBS [Frank Stanton's bailiwick] for 320, against 5,300; on NBC [which also cooperated with the Frankfurt School project] for 431, against 4,234. Total: for Nixon 1,620, against 17,027.

[Opinion] words spoken about Black Militants: on ABC, for 2052, against 1,146; on CBS, for 1,578, against 742; on NBC, for 3,666, against 1,383. As for the white middle class: on ABC, for 142, against 731; on CBS, for 237, against 651; on NBC, for 0, against 1,017.

The problem is that networks unanimously give "preferential status to certain political positions and opinions"—to the Democrats as opposed to Republicans, to the opinions of anti-war people as opposed to those who see some justification for the war, to black militants as opposed to the white middle class. "Not one reporter on CBS or NBC is critical of black power violence during the coverage period," writes Miss Efron.

QED for the objectivity of the Frankfurt School's Research Project. And so much for the induced "objectivity" of ABC, CBS, and NBC, in their Morning News coverage of political news, abortion, gun control, education, and terrorism in the schools. The measure can be taken when Dan Rather, the anchor man for CBS News, got his job by the vulgar name-calling and political baiting of two sitting Republican presidents, by his attempted smear of a third in 2004, and by his unremitting warfare against conservatives.

★ ★ ★

[17]

Fraud's Apotheosis: The Authoritarian Personality

In the annals of intellectual fraud, there are few cases which surpass that of the Frankfurt School's put-on of the American Jewish Committee, the highly-respected voice of conservative U.S. Jewry, the Jewish Labor Committee on the liberal left, as well as the psychoanalytical and sociological academic establishment. For here a group of renegade and anti-Semitic Jews in the Frankfurt School tent staunchly and obsessively dedicated to their own and to the violently anti-Jewish preachments of Karl Marx were able to con the Committee into lending its imprimatur to a research project to determine the causes of anti-Semitism and draw up a strategy to fight it—with the active support of the Dubinsky-esque Jewish Labor Committee.

That the Critical Theorists had previously attacked Judaism in the most virulent terms, never once recalling the murderous anti-Jewish policies of Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union, was a topic not to be mentioned. In certain quarters, exposing "anti-Semitism" had become a profitable cottage industry—and profit was always in the mind of Max Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School. It was particular so when Horkheimer and the Institute began mobilizing for its "Authoritarian Personality" program. The war had some of its great stars, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Neumann, and a host of others, holding positions of authority in OSS,

the Office of War Information, and the Pentagon. It was a risky time for the Frankfurt School. Not only could its anti-Semitic record in Germany be discovered, but also its earlier studies on prejudice which had shown that anti-Semitism existed more violently among the lower economic classes than among what it labeled the "reactionary" and "fascistic" middle and upper classes.

Studies being conducted by the Frankfurt School made real problems for Horkheimer, now on the American Jewish Committee payroll and accepting the Yankee dollar from anti-Communist labor sources. "The conclusions of the [earlier] study," as Martin Jay put it, "were so damaging to American labor that the Institute, with its characteristic caution," knew that to even make them known, much less publishing them would be disastrous, and it did not. Another study demonstrated that Catholics and conservatives had given more aid to Jewish victims of Nazism than Protestants and liberals, and this too was never published.

Horkheimer's views on anti-Semitism were indicated in a curious letter to one of his associates: "The root of fascist agitation is the fact that there is something rotten in language itself. The rottenness I have in mind is a phenomenon which is expressed in Jewish religion by the verdict against trying to call God by His name and by the story of the Tower of Babel. . . . We must beware of the idea that the fascist use of language is something radically new in our society The distrust of the peasant against the city-dweller with his mastery of language was partly justified. This distrust is an element of anti-Semitism itself, and the Jew who manipulates language so easily is not free from guilt in the prehistory of what you explain as the fascist handling of language. Here, too, the Jew is the pioneer of capitalism."

The fact, of course, is that "anti-Semitism" is a meaningless and ambiguous term. The Arabs are Semites, yet historically have been as cruel to Jews as the Inquisition. Hitler welcomed the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem to Berlin where he sought to lead the Arabs in a mid-East Holocaust. And Ferdinand and Isabella expelled the Jews, partly because of the demands of the Inquisition, but also because the Jewish upper and middle class had financially bailed out the monarchy repeatedly, and it was easier to expel than to honor the debt. Horkheimer, Adorno, and the Frankfurt School now averred that anti-Semitism was the product of Western cul-

ture—capitalism, the nuclear family, capitalism, rainy weather, the Jews themselves, and of course religion—since both Christianity and Islam were rooted in Judaic monotheism and patriarchy. Had they been offered a bundle to prove that anti-Catholicism in America derived from the Talmud, they would have accepted gratefully. But anti-Semitism fitted in nicely with neo-Freudian analyses of "capitalist" culture and theories of the "unconscious" and the "subconscious"—more useful than the vagaries of the id, the super-ego, and the Oedipus complex.

The concept of the "authoritarian personality" had always been a weapon used by the Frankfurt School to attack and obliterate political opponents. Early "researches" into authoritarianism were measured on a scale devised in early studies by Erich Fromm. At the proscribed end was "fascism" (which the Critical Theorists never admitted had little in common with Nazism but its totalitarianism), capitalism, religion, and the family; at the "good" end was the "revolutionary personality," a "sociometric" and "anthropological" construct based not on actions or speech or conscious thought, but on the measurement of unconscious or subconscious attitudes and predilections, of which there was no definition, and no defense. That is, if an individual had been an unprotesting part of a traditional family or had religious convictions, this was proof positive that whatever his life had been he had an "authoritarian personality" and was prone to the appeal of fascism, to which he would bend under pressure. As opposed to this were the "revolutionary" personality types. That anti-Semitism had existed long before the advent of capitalism little bothered the Critical Theorists.

In Fromm's study, workers were asked to list the important people in history. If that list included Alexander the Great, Marx, and Lenin, this was evidence of an "authoritarian" personality. If it included Socrates, Pasteur, Kant, Marx, and Lenin, that was evidence of a "revolutionary" personality. That Marx and Lenin were on both lists did not trouble the Critical Theorists. A study of the Frankfurt School, in the journal *Fidelio* points out:

> A vital corollary of this typology in the early period was the [Frankfurt School's] definition of fascism. The definition itself was of some debate within the Institute, but all sides agreed that fascism's development

was inherent in the capitalist system. The most well known analyst of Nazism was Franz Neumann. . . . Neuman's research ends up as a large book, *Behemoth,* published in 1942. The book's thesis was that the class war between capitalism and the proletariat had moved into an anarchic form—forcing capital into a defensive alliance with authoritarian political movements. Economically, Nazism was "a private capitalist economy regimented by the totalitarian state . . . . 'Totalitarian Monopoly Capitalism'."

There is an aspect of Neuman's work which is specially striking . . . . He consciously denigrated the Nazis' appeal to the anti-Semitism of the German population, going so far as to claim that Germans were the "least anti-Semitic of all" Europeans. . . . A few years later, when the Institute's interests changed, such statements were to be a substantial source of embarrassment. . . . The debate within the Institute was not about anti-Semitism, but over Neuman's thesis that a private capitalist economy still existed in Nazi Germany. ISR Director Max Horkheimer especially argued that Nazism was really "state capitalism." The essence of capitalism is domination: "This mentality of man as the master can be traced back to the first chapters of Genesis."[49]

The Frankfurt School's onetime view that Nazism was not basically anti-Semitic vanished when ideology was confronted by the need for capitalist cash during the wartime drought. Max Horkheimer approached the American Jewish Committee, receiving a grant plus additional funds from the Jewish Labor Committee, an adjunct of New York's garment unions. So taken in was the Committee that it created a Department of Scientific Research, with Horkheimer as the founding director. In both capacities, *die schoene Max* presided over the creation of a ponderous manuscript which presumed to measure prejudice and offer a methodology for its elimination. But the work was too flawed and too ideologically weighted to stand even friendly scrutiny, and though a contract had been signed for its publication, Horkheimer withdrew it. But the material collected was too politically important for the Frankfurt School's purposes to be jettisoned, and though laundered, was incorporated in the five volume, 1,300 page, *Studies in Prejudice.* Of these, three are of interest to this account.

The first was *Dynamics of Prejudice: A Psychological and Socio-*

logical Study of Veterans by Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, both of the University of Chicago. It was based on interviews of four to seven hours of male veterans in Chicago. It was their hope to find in this group the gross disillusionment and predilection for "fascism" that had existed among veterans in the Weimar Republic—overlooking the fact that German soldiers had returned to a crushed and bankrupt society, whereas in America veterans had returned to an optimistic and booming economy. They expected that the frustrations, petty tyrannies, and loss of personal freedom in military service would lead to the *kulturpessimismus* so beloved by the Frankfurt School. What Bettelheim and Janowitz discovered, to their shock, was that this was far outweighed by the feeling of liberation from time-clock punching and unsatisfying work that military service had provided to many. This was not a submissive surrender to military discipline, such as it was in a "civilian" army, but something far more complex. They learned that prejudice was most prevalent among those who resisted military society. Carefully avoided was the embarrassing fact that black victims of prejudice were far more given to anti-Semitism than lower-class whites. One of Martin Jay's comments on this volume should raise eyebrows:

> Among the conclusions reached by Bettelheim and Janowitz were the following. Tolerance tended to correlate positively with such variables as ego strength and acceptance of external authority (acceptance, it should be noted, was said to differ from submission, but whatever the term, this was a conclusion very much at odds with that reached in *The Authoritarian Personality*).

Anti-Semitism an Emotional Disorder: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation by Nathan Ackerman and Marie Jahoda, both later to become ornaments of British Intelligence's far-left Tavistock Institute. Ackerman was a Freudian psychoanalyst and Marie Jahoda's participation was mostly due to her previous relationship with Paul Lazarsfeld, as a colleague and wife when he was at the Institute in Frankfurt. Material for the study came from twenty-five practicing New York psychoanalysts. Forty case studies came from their clinical practice. The other two works were *Prophets of Deceit*, a study of charismatic leadership by Leo Lowenthal and Norman

Guterman and *Rehearsal for Destruction*, a historical discussion of the German anti-Semitism which Franz Neumann had vowed did not exist, by Paul Massing, former husband of the NKVD spy and recruiter Hede Massing.

The fifth volume, however, was the only one which had real impact, and might have been a part of George Orwell's *1984*—*The Authoritarian Personality* by Theodor Adorno, Else Fenkel-Brunswik, Daniel Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. Of these, Frenkel-Brunswick was working with Tavistock, though heading with Levinson and Sanford the Berkeley Public Opinion Study Group at the University of California. This volume requires a substantial and willful suspension of disbelief. In tribute, so to speak, to the American Jewish Committee's capitalists, it changed the former labeling of the "revolutionary personality" to the "democratic personality." It did not retreat from the anti-Semitic assumption that Judaism was a cause of anti-Semitism.

The Authoritarian Personality was the kingpin work and a money-machine. Its objective was the delineation, and in effect the creation, of a "new anthropological type"—as it would be proclaimed in the text of the study: the "authoritarian personality." The syndrome included the "findings" of Erich Fromm in an earlier Frankfurt School study, and though this was not disclosed to the backers, the "Jew-type" and the synesthesic "S-type" constructed by Nazi psycholologist E. R. Jaensch in 1938. There was a relationship also with the anti-Semitism of Jean-Paul Sartre's moonings. Horkheimer, on the basis of ratiocination, would establish the nature of the authoritarian personality as

> a mechanical surrender to conventional values; blind submission to authority together with blind hatred of all opponents and outsiders; anti-introspectiveness; rigid stereotyped thinking; a penchant for superstition; vilification, half-moralistic and half-cynical, of human nature; projectivity.

These were all *a priori* conclusions, as Adorno made clear when he wrote that the Institute did not intend, in its report, "to prove or disprove our theory through our findings but only to derive from it concrete questions for investigation, which must then . . . demonstrate certain prevalent socio-psychological struc-

tures." This followed the Kinsey system of methodology and research, applauded and adopted by the Institute in sexual matters, of falsifying research, distorting or inventing statistics, basing conclusions on subjective beliefs, and ending always in orgasm. The team scattered questionnaires, and from them selected forty men and forty women to be "analyzed " by nine interviewers. The results were measured against an F[ascist] scale, an A[nti]S[emitism] scale, an E[thnocentrism] scale, and a P[olitical and economic] scale which presumable tested nine personality variables, which were to dredge up you-know-what. But somehow, these scales seemed to get tangled up, so the researchers made a distinction between true conservatives (non-authoritarian) and (authoritarian) pseudo-conservatives—though where the dichotomy occurs remained clouded in Critically Theoretical mysticism:

> *Conventionalism.* Rigid adherence to conventional middle-class values.
>
> *Authoritarian Submission.* Submissive, uncritical attitude towards idealized moral authorities of the in-group.
>
> *Authoritarian Aggression.* Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish, people who violate conventional values.
>
> *Anti-Introspection.* Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
>
> *Stereotypy.* The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
>
> *Power and Toughness.* Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power-figures; over-emphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego, exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
>
> *Destructiveness and Cynicism.* Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
>
> *Projectivity.* The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outward of unconscious emotional impulses.
>
> *Sex.* Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings on."

The evaluation and scalar measurement of these characteristics was, of course, purely subjective—and as later critics of *The Authoritarian Personality*'s findings would point out, the political and ideological leanings of the study's directors were clearly manifest in the "results" they obtained. The statistical methodology and objectivity of the study were further put to question when it was shown that those chosen for interviews never represented a cross-section of the political arena. These and other criticisms were made by important sociologists, as Martin Jay notes.

> Why, [these critics asked] was authoritarianism associated with fascism alone and not communism? . . . Why was political and economic conservatism seen as connected with authoritarian, while the demand for state socialism was not? In short, why was the old left-right dichotomy upheld, when the real opposition was between liberal democracy and totalitarianism of both extremes?

There were many other criticisms of *The Authoritarian Personality*, including the devastatingly accurate charge that if the Frankfurt School were tested according to the formulae of their study, they would all come out with the scarlet A of Authoritarianism on their brows. Yet few noted—and this is evidence of the parlous state of academic principle—what was the overarching sin of the study. For what the Critical Theorists were claiming—for a large fee, of course—was that Freudian analysis and sociological measurement could pierce the psyche of an individual and determine that his unconscious and/or *subconscious* was *potentially* authoritarian and vulnerable to fascism. Its tests, one might easily conclude, were analogous to those which, until the 17th century, were employed to expose witches and witchcraft. The study's reasonings were reminiscent of the argument of "sophisticated" liberals that the Old Bolsheviks had patently not committed the crimes they were charged with in Stalin's "purge trials," but that their guilt was nevertheless real, in their minds and hearts.

The Authoritarian Personality, in a handful of years became the authority for smearing as "fascists" and "anti-Semites" those whose only sin was opposition to the New Left.

★ ★ ★

[18]

The Tragic Past, Present & Future, Part I

Did you know that truth does not exist and that all knowledge and values are artificial constructions to serve the interests of the powerful? If you don't know this, then you are obviously not the beneficiary of a recent American college education. A wide variety of academic subjects have appropriated Karl Marx's 19th century idea that "truth" is never more or less than propaganda that serves the material interests of the ruling class. So wrote Paul Craig Roberts, a Distinguished Fellow of the Cato Institute and a nationally syndicated columnist, in the Spring of 1999—in corroboration of all the foregoing and looking to the beginning of what was hailed as a new Millennium.

> The "isms" and "ists" of academic studies have only one purpose—to teach class, race, gender and other hatreds. Our college curriculums have many voices of hate busy at work preparing the next holocaust, but the voice of Christian love is considered too divisive to be tolerated. Dartmouth College prohibited copies of C. S. Lewis's *Mere Christianity* from being distributed as gifts to students. A dean ruled the book could be considered offensive.

It was a genuine *cri de coeur* by Roberts, but like other such cries, it failed to give the names, dates, and places of the conspira-

cy which afflicted America with hatred and the *kulturpessimismus* of the Frankfurt School and its neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian Critical Theorists—having aided in the rise of Hitler by supporting the delivery of the Weimar Republic to National Socialism, on the stubbornly ideological assumption that Nazism was merely an extension of capitalism and therefore would fall of its own weight. Leaving its spoor in the Tavistock Institute in England and in the alleyways of Paris where it shared office space on the Rue Montparnasse with some of the Comintern's numerous organizations, the Frankfurt School's capture of education led to the domination of the ranks, organs, and the ideology by educational professionals.

It also eliminated political neutrality and free speech in radio and television via the instrumentality of the Princeton Project and Paul Lazarsfeld, working through Frank Stanton of CBS, who passed the message on to the other networks, turning over the public airways to deconstructionism and the denunciation on America. Its "studies" on an alleged authoritarian personality tarred everyone to the right of center as "unconsciously" anti-Semitic and psychically a "fascist" activist. Its theory and practice, as we have seen, substituted "self-esteem," rampant sexuality and "dumbing down" of curricula, denying students the skills and knowledge necessary in a complex technological society. This has led to an adult analphabetism never before known in America. Its teachings on sex, distilled from Wilhelm Reich and Herbert Marcuse, were transferred to the criminally perverted and sexually maniacal Alfred Kinsey, whose studies of sexuality, approved by the Frankfurt School and its associates, were based not on studies of a cross section of Americans but on the practices of sex criminals in prison.[50]

"Why the Fuss?"

Defenders of the atrocities that began catching public attention in the Sixties are now attempting to pin the responsibility for the havoc on American business. They are best represented by John B. Judis, himself a graduate of the New Left, who wrote in the 31 August 1998 *Harper's*: "Why the fuss? Much of what disturbs the critics of the Sixties—from the spread of pornography to the denigration of the work ethic—was not the product of radical

agitators but of tectonic shifts in American capitalism." What were the causes? In the early Sixties, "Americans became concerned not only with obtaining lower prices for goods, but with government overseeing the safety, reliability, and quality of goods." And lo and behold, President Kennedy announced a "consumer bill of rights," and Congress passed "landmark legislation [sic] requiring flame-resistant fabrics in children's clothing." With a straight face, Judis states that at Berkley, "the Free Speech Movement of 1964—presumably aimed at reclaiming the rights of students to distribute political literature on campus—gave way the next year to the Filthy Speech Movement, aimed at defending students against literary and sexual censorship"—and encouraging pornography and obscenity.

That tells us what it was all about, with nothing about the students' assault on university administrations, the destruction of campus property, the sit-ins, the book-burnings, the total disruption of colleges and universities, and the propaganda of violence and hate. Judis does note that "During the fall semester of 1970, 140 bombings occurred; at Rutgers, classes had to be vacated 175 times because of bomb threats." And he hints—his major effort at accurate reporting—that much of this anarchy was encouraged by the Ford Foundation, headed by John McCloy, an enthusiast of the Frankfurt School since his days as American High Commissioner in Germany, and that the Rockefeller Foundation was no slouch at the same work.

"The New Left of the late '60s dreamed not of America's salvation but of its destruction. If socialism or the 'good life' were to come to the United States, it would come only after Armageddon—after a victorious armed struggle that would lay waste the United States," Judis admitted for his old comrades. But there is no explanation as to how a "tectonic change in American capitalism" had brought this about. Judis does confess that the movements of the '60s had the support of policy elites. "By 1968, these included the New York *Times* editorial board" and foundations and policy groups. Also praising the counterculture, and attributing it to the "change" in America capitalism was Yale Law School Professor Robert Reich, later to serve as President Clinton's Secretary of Labor.

Education was the key, and the means to subvert and control it did not begin with the Frankfurt School's 1930s invasion. As

far back as 1922, John Dewey's "Frontier Thinkers" group at Columbia, through his associates Dr. George Counts and Dr. Harold Rugg, were preaching that the schools should be an instrument for building a socialized economy. By 1932, Counts was orating to the Progressive Educationists that "historic capitalism will either have to be replaced altogether, or so changed . . . . that its identity will be completely lost." The same year, Counts would write, in *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order*: that "the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make most of their conquest is my conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school, they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes of, ideas, and behavior of the coming generation." In this, he was prophetic.

The arrival of the Institute for Social Research, and the preeminence given to it by Professors Dewey, MacIver, and Lynd, gave the National Education Association a firmer grip on educational ideology. When the Roosevelt Administration bestowed on it the status of a federally chartered corporation, analogous to the American Red Cross, mandating it as previously noted privileges and financial advantages that no other labor union possessed, it achieved what Dr. Counts had envisioned. As a federally chartered corporation, the NEA was forbidden to enter the political arena, to lobby Congress, or to dictate educational policy—but this the NEA ignored with impunity. Educational theory now was transmogrified into Marxist-Freudian sociology.

Education, it was realized, was the entering wedge. Capture education and you capture the future. The working press had never been the product of higher education. Some of the most outstanding newspapermen had never been to college and believed that their job was to report the news, not make it. There was a good deal of healthy cynicism in how they viewed politics and the world, and up to the 1940s they would sneer when some of their number called themselves "journalists" instead of newspapermen. Given the Frankfurt School's stranglehold on academia, through teachers colleges and the NEA, graduates who went into journalism had been brainwashed and indoctrinated in advance, and imbued with the Marcuse doctrine that tolerance of the right was evil, whereas tolerance of the left was proper and righteous.

In addition, neither high-school diplomas nor sheepskins

were a guarantee or indication that students had emerged from secondary or higher education with any real knowledge of mathematics, history, or the bases of American society. In many high-schools, for example, students were subjected to something called "connected mathematics," some assignments of which consisted in tossing marshmallows to see how many landed on their ends or their sides. In 1999, the Department of Education issued a list of ten "new math" programs which so appalled 200 mathematicians and scientists, including three Nobel laureates, that they paid for an ad in the *Washington Post*, calling on the Secretary of Education to rescind them.

Those programs had been sponsored since 1989 by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, dominated by Critical Theory thinking. Stanford University mathematics professor, R. James Milgram, discovered that even "highly motivated" math students could not do well in their classes because they had received a "third rate [secondary] education." And he noted that since 1989, when the "new math" programs had been introduced, the percentage of California State University students, restricted to the top 30 percent of the state's high school graduates, who were required to take remedial math, doubled from 23 percent to 55 percent. In Michigan, a student enrolled in an accelerated high school Core Plus pre-calculus program—"exemplary" according to the U.S. Department of Education—reported that in a University of Michigan course, "a vast majority of material in that course was material to which I had never been exposed [in high school.]" A parent testifying on the "dumbing down" of education before a hearing of a House Education subcommittee stated: "If medical doctors experimented with our kids in the same fashion [as educrats] do they would be in jail."

In 1844, Karl Marx had called for the "ruthless criticism of everything existing." In another context, he had written, "Material force can only be overthrown by material force; but theory itself becomes a material force when it has seized the masses." Lenin and Willi Muenzenberg understood better than Marx that the masses might occasionally be manipulated but that the major force was not the masses, not capital and labor, but the intellectuals and those who controlled the culture and molded the politicians. The Critical Theorists, for all their published blather, knew

that economic power was shifting in the corporate world, and that this power was moving from the creators and accumulators of wealth and enterprise to a managerial class. The managers were in a sense rootless, swayed by the ideological winds, and uneasy in their wealth. Subvert education and the media, poison mass culture, and there would be no need for violent revolution.

Recapitulating, it is interesting to turn back to the record and activities of Georg Lukacs, founder with the Comintern of the Frankfurt School The trade unionist Josef Lengyel recalled in 1959 that he was "literally dumfounded" to hear Lukacs dominating a "philosophical discussion of problems" before the Central Committee of the Communist Party. "One of these problems: We communists should take the sins of the world upon ourselves, so that we may be capable of saving the world. . . . Just as God ordered Judith to kill Holophernes—that is, to commit a sin—so He may order communists to destroy the bourgeoisie, both metaphorically and physically." Lukacs also professed that the "highest duty for communist ethics is to accept the need to act immorally. The true communist has the conviction that Evil will be transformed into Good, through the dialectic of historical development."

"Politics is only a means, [the destruction of] culture is the goal," Lukacs wrote in the Official Statement of the People's Commissariat of Public Education under Bela Kun. And as Victor Zitta, a contemporary, noted at a time when Lukacs was calling for the distribution to school children of free contraceptives, "Special lectures were organized in schools and literature printed and distributed to 'instruct' children about free love, about the nature of sexual intercourse [revolution through juvenile fornication], about the archaic nature of bourgeois family codes, about the outdatedness of monogamy, and the irrelevance of religion . . . This call to rebellion addressed to children was matched by a call to women. Among the numerous pamphlets published under Lukacs's auspices . . . one calls upon women to unite and overthrow the chains imposed on them by exploitive bourgeois-spirited males."

One analysis of Critical Theory and the Frankfurt School, adds:

> Lukacs's efforts to "abolish culture" were complemented by an appreciation for a new technology that was to become so important

> to students at the Frankfurt School: film. Lukacs set up a Chamber of Film within his Commissariat, which included Bela Lugosi, the ham actor of Dracula fame; and [KGB mole] Alexander Korda, who became one of the most powerful film producers in England, and was film-maker to British Intelligence during and after World War II. Lukacs was trying to "force-grow" a counterculture. He failed [in Hungary] . . . but his heirs were successful in their efforts at the same thing in America and Europe.

Lukacs's precepts of sex education, elaborated by the Frankfurt School's Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, and other Critical Theorists, with the added "authority" of neo-Freudianism, broadcast its litany glorifying homosexuality and radical feminism, with little difficulty in its dissemination. In the postwar year, close to 40 percent of deans and presidents of graduate schools of teaching were graduates of Columbia's Teachers College and most of the rest were products of NEA indoctrination. Of considerable importance to Critical Theory was Walter Lippmann and as earlier reported, his secretary and assistant, Soviet agent Mary Price.

Education almost throughout the United States is today marked by a total negation of both the First Amendment and academic freedom. During the so-called McCarthy era, the "educrats" loudly argued that those who objected to neo-Marxist and neo-Freudian professors and curricula were attempting to impose rigidly controlled education and end the free discussion of ideas. Since the 1960s, however, the same educrats have imposed the doctrines of Political Correctness and Marcuse's "tolerance of the left" but "intolerance of the right" to the point where those who disagree with Critical Theory or oppose reverse-racism must fear for their academic future, and sometimes even their physical safety.

In his book, *The Conspiracy of Ignorance,* Martin Gross gives chapter and verse as to how American education has been debased. Going back to the Eighteenth century, when Noah Webster published his *Blue-Backed Speller* (sales 24 million) children were taught to read by first learning the sound and the value of every letter of the alphabet, making any word available to them, or phonics. The geniuses at Teachers College and the NEA decided, as has been noted, that phonics were reactionary and came up with something called, "whole language" or "look-say" which forces

the child to learn and memorize many thousands of words. Reports Martin Gross:

> In the fourth grade, 38 percent of the children nationally are reading 'below basic', a form of semi-illiteracy. In central cities, that figure rises to 47 percent, the cause of failure in other subjects. As a result, California has fallen to bottom place in the national test of reading. . . . But it was not, as some charged mainly because of a failure by minority children. White youngsters in California scored last nationally as well. Since then, legislation has been signed by [now former] Governor Pete Wilson, reintroducing phonics in California schools and the state has risen four places [in reading]. In the midst of African-American poverty in Brooklyn, Irwin Kurz, the principal of PS 161, brought in phonics, and 83 percent of minority children in the third grade now read at grade level, far above the city average. . .
>
> While most Europeans begin the study of physics in middle school [junior high], in the United States only one in five take it by the time they graduate from high school. Geography is becoming a lost discipline. In a recent test, 57 percent of students failed that vital subject, unable to identify such places as the Mediterranean Sea. . . . American history is one of the most important of studies, yet perhaps the most neglected . . . .That explains why on national tests, three out of five did not know that the Pilgrims and Puritans came here for religious freedom, while seven in 10 did not know that New York was one of the 13 original colonies. Worse yet, 60 percent did not know when the Civil War was fought— the result of the establishment's peculiar theory that dates are not important in history.

What has happened in high school is repeated in college. A tremendous body of literature has been shunted aside because it is the product of "dead white males," replaced, as one commentator has pointed out, by "the insignificant or even incoherent work by a minor writer because she is a woman or homosexual (or both), unlike those who wrote the *Federalist Papers*. Georgetown University, a Catholic College once noted for its intellectual excellence, offers its scholars a course on "History and Theories of Sexuality." Let the columnist Suzanne Fields report on her experiences in lecturing to college classes:

> At Oberlin College, an English course is devoted to a work by one Really Dead White Man. *Paradise Lost* is described in the catalogue as a feminist approach to John Milton's poem: "This complex and powerful poem may be seen both as a monument to patriarchy and a manifesto for resistance. Feminist, historicist, narrative and poetical theory will be brought to bear on issues raised by the poem, its interpretation and its cultural basis.

Perhaps it's a good thing that Johnny Can't Read. But there is more.

> The "gender studies" gobbledegook prize goes to Bowdoin College in Maine for a women's studies course in "Music and Gender." It asks students the following question: "Is Beethoven's Ninth Symphony a marvel of abstract architecture, culminating in a gender-free paean to human solidarity, or does it model the processes of rape?"

The "dumbing down" of education mandated by Teachers College's Critical Theorists. the all-powerful National Education Association, and the captive U.S. Department of Education, has reached such magnitude that it has even been noticed by the Associated Press. In a 10 December 1999 dispatch, the AP headlined that "High Schoolers Lack Math, Reading Skills for Jobs or College." This was not so in the early 1930s. Take, for example, New York's now-pitiful public education system, then among the best both nationally and in the world. For admission to the College of the City of New York, a 90-point high school average was once required, and Hunter College, also part of the city system, demanded similar excellence. Now there are "open admissions." The required high school diploma merely indicates that the applicant had the patience to apply the seat of the pants to the seat of the school chair for four years.

The AP story reported what NEA dictatorship over education has wrought:

> Many American young people are totally undone by the gaps between high school and college," said Kati Haycock, director of the Education Trust in Washington, which examined state academic standards and prepared a report [on state education standards]. For

> graduates who turn to the field of work—two thirds of high school graduates never earn a four-year college degree—the situation isn't much better. . . . As a result, many graduates find their diplomas to be "little more than a ticket to nowhere," said Janis Somerville, the director of the National Association of Systems Heads. "Adding insult to injury, we blame the kids. " In 1997, a third of [entering] college students had to take remedial courses in reading, writing or math. The courses essentially reviewed what they were supposed to have learned in secondary school. . . . Earlier this year [1999], a coalition of business leaders. . . . complained that students were graduating from high school without the skills to handle [jobs] in today's workplace.

Who is to blame? Dr. Thomas Sowell has reported on how the educrats have responded to this:

> In Virginia, each school was supposed to have at least 70 percent of its students pass the state's exam, in order for the school to retain its accreditation. When only 7 percent of the students passed the exams, the requirements were waived. In Arizona, only one tenth of the high school sophomores passed the new math exam and the state agreed to "reconsider" its requirements. Wisconsin has already withdrawn a test it was going to require students to pass as a condition of graduation. In short, the prevailing philosophy seems to be: If the students don't reach the standards bring the standards down to them. In reality, critics have told the [NEA] "educators" what they should do, for decades on end, and they have not shown the slightest interest in doing it.
>
> Phonics, the three Rs instead of psychobabble and propaganda courses, parental choice and serious testing of students and teachers have all been suggested—and all bitterly resisted by [the NEA and the educrats] . . . . When top scientists offered to create a science curriculum for the high schools of California, the offer was rejected by the [educrat] establishment . . . The real problem with these "educators" is that they are themselves the most fundamental obstacle to improvement. So long as public school teachers and administrators are drawn primarily from the bottom layers of college students so long as they have ironclad tenure, so long as their pay is wholly divorced from performance, and so long as they have a

> monopoly of the vast majority of students, everything else is just rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. There is no point in trying to teach elephants [would-be teachers] how to fly. If you want flying, you had better get birds. So long as mindless education courses repel intelligent people from the teaching profession, you are not going to have the caliber of teachers or administrators needed.

There are some who argue bemusedly that all of this is due to bureaucratic sloth, government power-grabbing, and a society grown economically fat and corrupt. But the fact is that it began long before this, in the Depression era and in the dislocations of World War II, at the time when the general public was concerned more with keeping its head above water and in winning an overarching military conflict. It was then that the Frankfurt School and its many adherent, entrenched in the governmental, sociological, and academic infrastructure began taking over The question can be asked: How could they accomplish this? It can be answered by another question: How could Lenin, with a party heavily outnumbered conquer the vast reaches of Russia?

American education was keel-hauled at a time when the country was most eager to give advanced education to its youth as a guarantor of a better-motivated and more prosperous life. American science and American productivity were the greatest in the world, and hundreds of thousands of parents mortgaged themselves to provide their sons and daughters with the educational wherewithal for success, at a price which the educrats multiplied annually.

The Critical Theorists and their neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian adherents, in and out of the Frankfurt School, had their own agenda. They knew that in a free society, education must incorporate the past and the present, and the free dissemination of ideas, to create a free and successful future. Political correctness, now the shroud of education, was required to shut off diversity of thought and ideology. Dumbing down education to the basics of drugs, sex, violence, and "self-esteem," with the inclusion of a little rape and "gangsta" rap, would achieve this. Feminism, to castrate energetic achievers and destroy the social fabric and the social stability offered by marriage and family, was the ticket—and college dormitories which encouraged student promiscuity were one way to draw the young into the loop.

The Critical Theorists made no bones, and make none now, as to their aims. Professor Charles Pierce, of the Department of Educational Psychiatry at Harvard, a guru of the Humanist movement attached to the Franklin School, said in his keynote address to 2,000 teachers attending the Child International Education Seminar in Denver (1973):

> Every child in America entering school at the age of five is insane because he comes to school with certain allegiances to the Founding Fathers, towards his parents, towards our elected officials, toward a belief in a supernatural being, and toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity. It's up to you, teachers, to make all these sick children well by creating the international child of the future.

And John J. Dunphy, a Humanist and educrat, writing in the *Humanist* (1983): "I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers that correctly perceive their role as proselytizers of a new faith which will replace the rotting corpse of Christianity."

★ ★ ★

[19]

The Tragic Past, Present & Future, Part II

The drug culture—and this was essential to the Frankfurt School's agenda, particularly as enunciated and preached by Herbert Marcuse—towered in importance. And here the Critical Theorists worked jointly with their allies at the Tavistock Institute and tear-it-down activists like Aldous Huxley and Timothy Leary, along with their supporters in the groves of academe and such ideologically penetrated government organisms as the U.S. Office of Education and the CIA. It has been said that CIA did not sponsor the drug culture, and this is true. But it ignores the OSS which set up a unit to experiment in the use of hashish as a "truth drug' to be used in the interrogation of enemy agents. Allen Dulles, OSS station chief in Switzerland and later to head the CIA, discovered the effects of LSD, created for Sandoz Laboratories by chemist Albert Hoffman, which under OSS direction began indiscriminate use of hashish, LSD and other proscribed drugs.[51]

Both the Comintern and the Frankfurt School subscribed to a "plant-you-now-dig you-later" program. The OSS was disbanded, but when President Truman created the Central Intelligence Agency, many of the Marcuse-Neumann-indoctrinated sociologists and psychologists moved into it. Experiments in the use of drugs were begun under the code names of Operation Bluebird and Operation Artichoke, then expanded into Operation

MK-Ultra, under Clandestine Operations chief (and later CIA director) Richard Helms. It was through Helms that a major U.S. drug manufacturer was induced to produce LSD in quantity for the "experimental" use of the Agency.

The CIA and the Pentagon thereupon began large-scale LSD experimentation both on unwitting civilians and on Armed Forces personnel—even to conducting war games in which several small Army units were given the drug without their knowledge and then closely observed as they attempted to do their part in the military exercise. It is a matter of record that at a dinner party for CIA colleagues, MK-Ultra informed them that something special had been put into their dessert. One guest did not come down, was rushed to a hospital, and threw himself out of the window to his death. So widespread was the "experimental" use of LSD, that CIA's Internal Security unit had to urge that the drug not be put in the punchbowl at an office Christmas party. In Operation Midnight Climax, the CIA (in conjunction with the Narcotics Bureau) staffed a San Francisco safe-house with prostitutes who would give their "clients" acid while the festivities were being filmed. This practice was continued until 1963, when it was discovered by a new CIA Inspector General who shut down the sex-and-acid facility.

Not to gild the lily, there is the case of Capt. Alfred Hubbard, formerly of OSS, and later a CIA contract worker, who recruited a researcher of hallucinogens in Canada, who in turn gave Aldous Huxley, comrade-at-arms of the Frankfurt School, his first "trip" with government-financed LSD. Huxley's second trip was with Hubbard, who purchased with Frankfurt School encouragement and CIA compliance 6,000 bottles of LSD and toured the country giving away samples to faculty members and undergraduates. Hubbard was very rich, and through a Los Angeles psychiatrist and the Frankfurt School cell in the movie colony he set up acid sessions which contributed significantly to deconstructionism, horror, and bloody violence in film-making.

California, to which Frankfurt School scholars and film-makers had migrated, became a center for the government-financed drug programs, and Gregory Bateson, husband and collaborator of anthropologist Margaret Mead, was brought into the campaign of organized encouragement of the drug culture through membership in the Frankfurt School contingent in OSS's Research &

Analysis branch, Herbert Marcuse's bailiwick. Time-Life mogul Henry Luce was drawn into the movement by a Veterans Hospital psychiatrist who took him on a "trip," and he spent long evenings with Aldous Huxley and Christopher Isherwood learning the virtues of drug use. This resulted in an approving article in *Life*, by a converted young Harvard psychology PhD, Timothy Leary, with ties to the Institute. In turn, Leary convinced his department chairman, Henry Murray, to inaugurate drug experiments. He also became a pro-drug propagandist and provider, organizing an LSD group which included Mary Pinchot, the wife of CIA official Cord Meyer. Leary was eventually fired by Harvard, but his group spread in influence, including former OSS and present CIA personnel. One member, supplying the terrorist Red Brigades, was arrested and tried, but released when the court ruled that he was working under CIA orders.

The enshrinement of drugs by the Frankfurt School and the New Left was an important part of the neo-Marxist destructionist doctrine. It would be, as Aldous Huxley and Timothy Leary had hopefully predicted, the means to anesthetize the people. The neo-Freudians had cannily moved to "get them while they're young." Encouraged by the "new education" which taught school children that they should reject their parents' authority and values, the young joined the drug epidemic. Health & Human Services Secretary Donna Shalla patted herself on the back in announcing the results of a 1999 Monitoring the Future drug use survey of 45,000 8th, 10th, and 12th graders. Actually, the results were dismal, particularly when measured against an elementary school system which boasted of its therapies.

As reported by the *Washington Times*:

> Eighth grade use [of drugs] rose from 18.7 percent in 1991 to a peak of 31.2 in 1996 before dropping to 28.3 in 1999.
>
> Tenth grade use rose from 30.6 percent in 1991 to a peak of 47.3 in 1997. It fell to 44.9 percent in 1998 but rebounded to 46.2 percent in 1999.
>
> Twelfth grade use hit a low of 40.7 percent in 1992 and reached a new high in 1999 with 54.7 percent of seniors saying they have used an illicit drugs.

Educators who argued, in favor of Wilhelm-Reichian sex education, that "knowledge is good"—that "knowledge" being a celebration of childhood and early teenage promiscuity, homosexuality, and disregard of their parents, all in the interest of preventing pregnancy—pressed increasingly and successfully, mocking advocates of abstinence, attacking opponents as patriarchal, anti-societal, and religious bigots. A report of the Alan Guttmacher Institute, in conjunction with the Kaiser Family Foundation, determined that this "knowledge" is not good but indeed bad, and that abstinence is the sole method of eliminating childhood and teenage pregnancies. Handing out condoms will not do it. According to the Guttmacher report, abstinence-only programs are taught in only a small minority of the nation's school districts, though in sub-Saharan Africa they have proven to be the sole approach to battling AIDS. And Cory Richards, vice president of the Institute, has wondered what the impact would be if hundreds of thousands of kids were "taught that contraception doesn't work well."

In the May-June 1999 issue of the Guttmacher Institute's magazine, *Family Planning Perspectives*, Jacqueline Duarte and colleagues offered the facts:

> In 1944, more than 1 in 5 unmarried girls under 18 who had sex got pregnant at least once.
>
> Eighteen percent of 18- and 19-year-old single women who had sex got pregnant at least once.
>
> Sixteen percent of 20-24-year-old women who had sex got pregnant at least once.
>
> Forty percent of sexually active teens got pregnant at least once by age of 20.
>
> A 16-year-old girl who decides to embark on sex and not marry for 10 years will get pregnant nine or 10 times before she says, "I do."

None of this takes into account the trauma and the destruction of their normal life among girls and women who are told in their sex education course to tuck a condom in their pocketbooks when they go out on a date, and get pregnant anyway. Nor would these statistics bother the Critical Theorists. As their publications and

other writings make plain, their sex-abounding indoctrination was based specifically on the alleged damage abstinence would do to the youth, and how it would contribute to the downfall of Western civilization—though sexual "liberation" was designed to turn young people against parents and religion.

At the same time, confrontation became the ritual behavior of the New Left which, as one observer put it, "itself became a major transmission belt of drugs onto American campuses." Many of Marcuse's New Left activists moved into new violent groupings, such as Up Against the Wall, Motherfucker, organized as previously noted by Marcuse's stepson and financed by the Ford Foundation. Marcuse's disciple's headed these organizations and they transformed violence "from ritual to a full fledged religion, with drugs as the sacrament." The 1960s brought the Frankfurt School into the battlefield, its battalions openly assaulting American society and America culture, with Marcuse at the head of the army. A visiting professor at Columbia, the French radical Lucien Goldmann, said of Marcuse that the student movements of the Sixties "found in his works and ultimately *in his works alone* the theoretical formulation of their problems and aspirations." Not to mention the destructive nihilism and the *kulturpessimismus* which he inculcated and inspired.[52] A very good case has been made that the return of the Frankfurt School to Germany, and Marcuse's reputation as the Mao Tse-tung of his country, re-legitimatised Marxism there and contributed mightily to the defeat of the Christian Democrats in 1971 and to the victory of Willi Brandt's Social Democratic Party, launching its policy of rapprochement with the Soviet Union.

Hatred of Technology

Two of Marcuse's great ogres were reason and technology—both equally horrendous to the New Left which saw in them democracy and the economic advancement in society which would preclude the destruction sought by the Critical Theorists. By all standards, the quality of life made a quantum leap in the 20th century—as Julian Simon demonstrates in his book, *Hoodwinking the Nation*—even in Africa where the end of colonialism in most instances brought native repression, dictatorship, political and economic corruption, and unrestricted misery to the people.

"Global warming" is a case in point. To begin with, all scientific evidence shows that man's contribution to the carbon dioxide which allegedly results in this phenomenon is almost microscopic compared to what nature creates. If industrial activity were completely shut down, its effect on global warming or cooling, which has occurred irrespective of man over the centuries, would be negligible. Of greater significance to the credibility of the propagandists for global warming is that two decades ago they were predicting, on the same data, that the earth was moving into an ice age. Most scientists would wholly agree that the earth's climate is relatively stable but has cooled a degree or two in the past years. But there are those who, following the footsteps of J. Robert Oppenheimer, Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies, and their hardly-secret indebtedness to Columbia's Institute for Social Research, journeyed to the White House and offered their wares to Vice President Albert Gore Jr. who agreed with them but made the puzzling remark that he "did not see how this problem could be solved without reference to spiritual values."

This was followed by the contention of Dick Forrister, head of the Clinton White House Office of Global Climate Change, before a meeting of the Energy Institute, that those who disagreed with the Vice President's views on global warming were "clowns." Shown statistics from the United Nations' Planet Climate Change, the U.S. Department of Commerce pointed out that whatever warming existed was negligible, and that the records of Weather balloon thermistors and barometers indicated cooling, Forrister blew up and called this evidence "frivolous." Frivolous as the contention that global warming would melt the polar ice-cap, raising the level of the oceans and flooding low-lying lands—a fraud ignoring that ice is expanded water, and that when it melts, water levels remain exactly the same—something any child or drinker can demonstrate by floating an ice cube in a glass.

Frivolity? Consider the case years ago of the Red River Gorge in Kentucky. Every three years or so the Red River flooded, wiping out crops and bringing devastation to the farmers of that depressed region. (Prior to that the gorge had been declared a disaster area by President Lyndon Johnson.) The Army Corps of Engineers proposed the building of a dam which would end the flooding, provide a water source for Lexington and a lake which

could be used recreationally, providing employment. The Sierra Club objected because the dam would destroy some interesting vegetation. and it mounted a protest which included that great humanitarian Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Jay Ambrose, now chief editorial writer for the Scripps Howard New Service but then a young reporter, asked one of the protesters what he would propose for the poor people of the area. "Why," he responded, "let them move away." But the environmentalists as usual triumphed over human beings and the dam was not built.

Like the radical feminists and the educrats, the environmentalists are also a product of Frankfurt School ideology. They are as ruthless in their war against people as the New Left, and as ideologically dishonest. They would rather see a child go hungry than swat a tse-tse fly. But though destructive as locusts, they have amassed tremendous political power, bringing together the malcontents, the haters of society, and the Chicken Littles, all believers that the destruction of Western civilization is the only way to save the environment. The depredations of the Critical Theory-inspired are beginning to be exposed, along with the strong-arm and dictatorial actions of the Environmental Protection Agency. An extended quotation from Simon's *Hoodwinking the Nation*, since it deals with *Earth in the Balance*, the head-scratchings of Albert Gore Jr., the nation's most eminent mythologist, "as ignorant a collection of clichés as anything ever published on the subject," is pertinent:

> After the obligatory drama about how "eight acres worth of prime topsoil floats past Memphis every hour," Gore says that Iowa "used to have an average of sixteen inches of the best topsoil in the world. Now it is down to eight inches." The first footnote in the book says that his source was "conversations with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship." . . . If Gore had done his homework, he would have found that the facts are exactly the opposite of what he writes. The farms in the U.S. are becoming less rather than more eroded. Decade after recent decade, fewer rather than more acres suffer from severe erosion.
>
> The second specific item Gore mentions is DDT [which the environmentalist lobby caused to be banned by scare talk of

poisoned milk], "which became for me a symbol of how carelessly our civilization could do harm to the world." He gives no data and provides no references, though later he adds that DDT "can be dangerous in tiny amounts." A touch of research would have turned up tons of writings such as *Mosquitoes, Malaria, and Man*, by Gordon Harrison, who was director of the Ford Foundation's environmental program. Gore would have learned that with the aid of DDT "India had brought down the number of malaria cases from the estimated 75 million in 1951 to about 50,000 in 1961. Sri Lanka reduced malaria from about three million after World War II to just 29 in 1964." Then [after the US banned the manufacture of DDT], "Endemic malaria returned to India like the turnaround of the tide. [By 1977] the number of cases [and deaths]reached at least 30 million and perhaps 50 million." Does that prove that DDT does harm to civilization or does good? . . . .

The scary scenarios in Rachel Carson's book, *Silent Spring* . . . turned out to be without foundation. In 1971, amidst the fight that led to the banning of DDT in 1972, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, distinguished biologist Philip Handler, said, "DDT is the greatest chemical that has ever been discovered."

Gore then went after Agent Orange [dioxin], which he said is "the suspected cause of chromosomal damage and birth defects, never mentioning that it was pronounced innocent in a Federal court of law, at which experts testified, or that the there is no scientific evidence of ill effects from dioxin. "The entire book is filled with this sort of environmental gossip, contradicted by solid data," Simon noted, and added, "Furthermore, the advisers Gore leans on heavily—Paul Ehrlich and Lester Brown—have been proven wrong in every one of the forecasts they have made in the past two decades, a truly astonishing record." Paul Ehrlich, however, never gives up. Every ten years, he has predicted that by the end of that decade the population explosion will bring worldwide starvation. He has repeated this prediction every decade without a blush.

Vehicles for "environmental activism" have been the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, Humanist societies and publications, Greenpeace, and numerous ad hoc groups, the Federal government, the Club of the Council of Rome, and the radical feminists.

Included also are those distraught souls who carry their hatred of Americans and humans in general by brandishing their spears for extreme neo-Marxism. Puzzled environmentalists have asked: "What do we do when an endangered species eats an endangered plant?" They have no answer, but they have spawned the inverse-terrorist movement raids and burnt the crops and the homes of those farmers who employ agricultural technology to improve crop yields.

They have also turned their guns on friendly Elsie the Cow and her kin. The environmentalists are up in arms over the flatulence and belching of cattle, which they claim is adding to carbon dioxide levels and contributing to "global warming." They are focusing their campaign on Eire where the emissions of cattle by mouth and bowel are accused of being alarmingly contributory to the alleged state of its biosphere. The environmentalists propose that the cattle population of that country be reduced until some form of bovine medication is developed to constrain the gas in Elsie's digestive system. With a good deal of unused illogic, the environmentalists invoke religion ("God loves the earth"), scrapping Genesis which proclaims:

> And God said [unto male and female], be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth, and every tree. . . . And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life . . .[53]

The Secret Aim of Environmentalism

The secret aim of environmentalism is, of course, that of Critical Theory and the ideologists of the Frankfurt School—to cripple productivity, to hamstring industry, and to create discontent by lowering the standard of living. This they have been achieving with increasing success, through the Environmental Protection Agency (which has thrown the protections of the Constitution into the trash can) and other government instrumentalities.

Consider then some of the franker statements of adjuncts or allies of the Frankfurt School:

- *The Council of the Club of Rome:* In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention. The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.[54]
- *Paul Watson, co-founder of Greenpeace:* I got the impression that instead of going out to shoot birds, I should go out and shoot the kids who shoot birds.
- *Jim Sibbison, former EPA press officer:* We routinely wrote scare stories about the hazards of chemicals, employing words like "cancer" and "birth defects.".. Our press releases were more or less accurate . . . . Few handouts, however, can be completely honest and ours were no exception. . . . We were out to whip the public into a frenzy about the environment.
- *Judi Bari* of *Earth First!*: I think if we don't overthrow capitalism, we don't have a chance of saving the world ecologically. I think it is possible to have an ecologically sound society under socialism. I don't think it is possible under capitalism
- *Former Vice President Al Gore in Earth in the Balance:* [We need] a coordinated global program to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine [the automobile].
- *Timothy Wirth, Clinton Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs* and named with Al Gore as part of the Green Leadership for the '90s: We've got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic policy and environmental policy.
- *Dr. Reed F. Noss, Wildlands Project,* which seeks to return "at least 50 percent of the U.S. core wilderness areas" in which "all evidence of human beings will be eradicated—homes, roads, powerlines, all things man-made: The col-

lective needs of non-human species must take precedence over the needs and desires of humans."

- *David Brower, director, Sierra Club and founder, Friends of the Earth:* "Loggers losing their jobs because of Spotted Owl legislation is, in my eyes, no different than people being out of work after the furnaces of Dachau shut down.
- *John Davis, editor of Wild Earth and the Earth First Journal:* "[Do the] 'Wild Earth' and the 'Wildlands Project' advocate the end of industrial; civilization? Most assuredly. Everything must go that is civilized."

In an article for the September 1996 *Insider's Report,* Kathleen Marquardt summarized the program of the Green movement and environmentalist leaders: "The extinction of *homo sapiens* would mean survival for millions, if not billions, of earth dwelling species. Phasing out the human race will solve every problem on earth, social and environmental. More than anything, the 'animal rights' movement is a smoke screen to attack humanity. This warped movement is simply a means for another group of extremists to gain political power. What makes them so dangerous is that their message is hidden behind the cuddly image of animals and pets we love."

It is hardly a secret that the Greens were organized as a means by a "group of extremists to gain political power." The Green Party was organized in Germany by Herbert Marcuse and others of the Frankfurt School. From Germany, the Green Party moved to California, where the Frankfurt School had left a hard-core of its adherents in the film industry and in San Francisco, perhaps the most politically eccentric and leftist city in the U.S. The EPA has been in the thrall of the Green Party and its Critical Theorists. It has given away millions, in violation of law, to radical "environmentalists" groups such as the Environmental Defense Fund (close to $1 million) which blocks road-building and suburban development, and the lobbying Surface Transportation Policy Project (more than $1 million) which promotes the diversion of Federal highway users fees to mass transportation. The Smart Growth Network, also receiving funds from EPA, wants to pack people in cities rather than allow them to move themselves and their children to a pleasant life in the suburbs or exurbia. More than four

out of five American workers drive to their jobs, and the environmentalists think this is disgraceful.

As nationally-syndicated columnist Michelle Malkin pointed out: "Anti-car forces refuse to acknowledge that mobility on the road means mobility up the social scale. Anti-suburban development environmentalists refuse to believe that most families really don't want to raise their children in crowded Manhattan high-rises or creaky San Francisco row houses."

But the Frankfurt School-inspired Green Party, in its ceaseless battle against the technology which is improving life in the world, has found a new cause—and one which gladdens the heart of its ideologists—a war against agricultural plenty. Pete Du Pont, former governor of Delaware and Chairman of the National Center for Policy Analysis, comments, though without naming the sponsors.

> The world is at a crossroads. One path takes us to a brighter future, one where it is possible to feed the world's growing population without increasing pesticide use or converting more forests and meadows to crop lands. The other path leads to lower food supplies, more illness and disease, and environmental degradation. Disturbingly, environmentalists are leading the charge to take the world down the second path.
>
> Environmentalists in Europe and the United States have targeted the use of genetic engineering and biotechnology to produce hardier, disease-resistant and pest resistant crops. These agricultural technologies hold out the best hope of feeding the growing population in the next century. But environmentalists argue that by altering crops, researchers are playing God and tampering with things beyond human understanding. The environmentalists have presented no evidence that bio-engineered crops pose a hazard to human health or the environment . . .
>
> Without the use of fire, automobiles, antibiotics, coffee, water, salt and chlorine—just to name a few natural and human-created foods, applications, and tools—human life, in the words of the philosopher Thomas Hobbes, would be nasty, poor, brutish and short. None of these products would pass the standard set by environmentalists . . .
>
> Human population is growing, especially in countries where

people are already malnourished [as the consequence of bad political decisions by governments]. The global population will peak at about 9 billion people. . . . If all the world's farmers adopted the best farming practices. . . . it might be possible to double the current crop yields on the same amount of land, but we need triple yields to feed the coming generations. Alternatively, if we went totally organic [as the Greens would have it] we would have to double the amount of land under active cultivation. This would be disastrous for wildlife and native plants which the Greens claim they want so passionately to protect . . .

But there is a third option: the judicious use of biotechnology. . . . Agricultural biotechnology is already improving lives. For instance . . . the Rockefeller Foundation's golden rice project. This genetically altered rice was modified to contain beta-carotene (which readily converts to Vitamin A) and new genes to overcome iron deficiency . . . . [G]olden rice is preventing thousands of cases of childhood blindness and reducing the amount of anemia suffered by more than 2 billion women in rice-dependent countries.

Using bio-engineered agricultural products . . . . we could increase the world's food production the threefold needed for the world's 9 billion people to eat well—and all without increasing the amount of acreage in production [or condemning] millions of people to unnecessary suffering and early deaths.

Herbert Marcuse's Greens and the Critical Theorists have decreed otherwise. They have launched an increasingly successful movement, based on the fears they have inspired in European farmers, to bar the import of genetically engineered American food products. That this movement will have seriously adverse effect on both the European and American economies, as well as on the world's population, hardly concerns the Greens or their ideological tutors, the Critical Theorists. Nothing will help create the conditions for a Marxist takeover as much as world-wide famine.

Looking back, the Frankfurt School could be proud of its wartime record. John Earl Hayes, a historian at the Library of Congress, and Harvey Klehr, professor of politics and history at Emory University, in their book *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*, estimate (based on KGB cables and such archival ma-

out of five American workers drive to their jobs, and the environmentalists think this is disgraceful.

As nationally-syndicated columnist Michelle Malkin pointed out: "Anti-car forces refuse to acknowledge that mobility on the road means mobility up the social scale. Anti-suburban development environmentalists refuse to believe that most families really don't want to raise their children in crowded Manhattan high-rises or creaky San Francisco row houses."

But the Frankfurt School-inspired Green Party, in its ceaseless battle against the technology which is improving life in the world, has found a new cause—and one which gladdens the heart of its ideologists—a war against agricultural plenty. Pete Du Pont, former governor of Delaware and Chairman of the National Center for Policy Analysis, comments, though without naming the sponsors.

> The world is at a crossroads. One path takes us to a brighter future, one where it is possible to feed the world's growing population without increasing pesticide use or converting more forests and meadows to crop lands. The other path leads to lower food supplies, more illness and disease, and environmental degradation. Disturbingly, environmentalists are leading the charge to take the world down the second path.
>
> Environmentalists in Europe and the United States have targeted the use of genetic engineering and biotechnology to produce hardier, disease-resistant and pest resistant crops. These agricultural technologies hold out the best hope of feeding the growing population in the next century. But environmentalists argue that by altering crops, researchers are playing God and tampering with things beyond human understanding. The environmentalists have presented no evidence that bio-engineered crops pose a hazard to human health or the environment . . .
>
> Without the use of fire, automobiles, antibiotics, coffee, water, salt and chlorine—just to name a few natural and human-created foods, applications, and tools—human life, in the words of the philosopher Thomas Hobbes, would be nasty, poor, brutish and short. None of these products would pass the standard set by environmentalists . . .
>
> Human population is growing, especially in countries where

people are already malnourished [as the consequence of bad political decisions by governments]. The global population will peak at about 9 billion people. . . . If all the world's farmers adopted the best farming practices. . . . it might be possible to double the current crop yields on the same amount of land, but we need triple yields to feed the coming generations. Alternatively, if we went totally organic [as the Greens would have it] we would have to double the amount of land under active cultivation. This would be disastrous for wildlife and native plants which the Greens claim they want so passionately to protect . . .

But there is a third option: the judicious use of biotechnology. . . . Agricultural biotechnology is already improving lives. For instance . . . the Rockefeller Foundation's golden rice project. This genetically altered rice was modified to contain beta-carotene (which readily converts to Vitamin A) and new genes to overcome iron deficiency . . . . [G]olden rice is preventing thousands of cases of childhood blindness and reducing the amount of anemia suffered by more than 2 billion women in rice-dependent countries.

Using bio-engineered agricultural products . . . . we could increase the world's food production the threefold needed for the world's 9 billion people to eat well—and all without increasing the amount of acreage in production [or condemning] millions of people to unnecessary suffering and early deaths.

Herbert Marcuse's Greens and the Critical Theorists have decreed otherwise. They have launched an increasingly successful movement, based on the fears they have inspired in European farmers, to bar the import of genetically engineered American food products. That this movement will have seriously adverse effect on both the European and American economies, as well as on the world's population, hardly concerns the Greens or their ideological tutors, the Critical Theorists. Nothing will help create the conditions for a Marxist takeover as much as world-wide famine.

Looking back, the Frankfurt School could be proud of its wartime record. John Earl Hayes, a historian at the Library of Congress, and Harvey Klehr, professor of politics and history at Emory University, in their book *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America,* estimate (based on KGB cables and such archival ma-

terial as the Russians released after the collapse of the Soviet state) that OSS was staffed on a ratio of 1-to-3 to 1-to-7 with Communists and Soviet agents.[55]

The war's end and the penetration of Frankfurt School operatives in the U.S. and Allied military governments of Germany and Austria were moving on apace. At home, if this country could be called home to the naturalized members of the Frankfurt School cabal, the seeds they had planted in education, in communications, and in societal relations were sprouting happily. Its profitable studies on the "authoritarian personality" were nearing completion—and the foundations were diminishing their financial aid.

The Cold War had seen the demise of the Comintern and its personnel merged with the KGB—and the Frankfurt School was now directly in touch with Moscow through KGB channels, as the Venona intercepts clearly indicate. The Frankfurt School's "charter" had given it considerable latitude, even to mild criticism of the USSR in order to establish its impartiality. But there were ominous signs that Stalin was preparing to adopt a "solution to the Jewish Problem" similar to Hitler's.

The Return to Germany

The pull was great to return to Germany. One of Horkheimer's associates urged him to come home, saying in a letter that "the better students and the intellectuals in Germany are more interested in getting your writings than in getting food." Critical Theory had been thoroughly planted in academic America, even to an "independent" Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. By the late 1940s, Horkheimer was writing to Leo Lowenthal, a member of the Institute, that a branch in Frankfurt would be useful in teaching American sociological techniques to German students. With Columbia losing interest in the Institute, however, Horkheimer clung to the hope that universities in the Los Angeles area, whose climate and proximity to Hollywood money he enjoyed, would offer affiliation. But after a triumphal visit to Germany and to Frankfurt University, he changed his mind.

One of the prime movers for bringing Horkheimer back to Frankfurt was U.S. High Commissioner John J. McCloy who, having been smarmed by Herbert Marcuse, was one of the Frankfurt

School's great admirers. At McCloy's urging, Frankfurt University agreed to reopen its doors to Horkheimer and those of his Frankfurt School colleagues who wished to return. There was one obstacle. Under U.S. law, Horkheimer would lose his American naturalization by permanently resettling in his country of origin. McCloy took care of that, sponsoring legislation passed by Congress continuing Horkheimer's American citizenship. Theodor Adorno, one of the few who accompanied Horkheimer back to Frankfurt, lost his U.S. citizenship. Henryk Grossman, another colleague, made a beeline for the Soviet zone.

Institute members who remained: Leo Lowenthal, becoming research director of the Voice of America; KGB agent Franz Neumann, leaving OSS for Columbia University; Gerhard Meyer, going to the University of Chicago; Otto Kirchheimer, continuing in government, first as a research analyst in the State Department Division of Research and then as division's chief of its Central European branch; Paul Massing, Joseph Maier, and Moses Finklestein, joining the Rutgers faculty; and, of course, Herbert Marcuse, moving eventually to Brandeis Also among those who did not return was Karl Wittfogel, one of the few original members of the Institute with open Communist Party membership, and an outstanding scholar in Chinese history, who had quietly left the Party and his association with both the Frankfurt School and the covertly KGB-run Institute for Pacific Relations, establishing the Chinese History Project at Columbia, though he did not publicly express his anti-Communism until years later when he was subpoenaed by the Senate Internal Security subcommittee. This resulted in his virtual ostracism by academics throughout the country and hostility from his colleagues at Columbia.

It was not until 1950 that the Institute reopened in Germany, after a petition by an impressive list of academics including G.D.H. Cole, Raymond Aron, James H. Shuttle, Paul Tillich, and Robert MacIver. "The function of a revived Frankfurt [School] would be twofold," the petition pleaded, "the planning and conduct of research projects, and perhaps more significant, the instruction of a new generation of German students in modern developments of social science." The U. S. High Commissioner's office supplied half the necessary finances for re-establishing the Institute at Frankfurt University, one-third came from the Institute's remain-

ing funds, and the rest from the City of Frankfurt and private donors. In time, the Institute, which in its Weimar period had been called by its students "the Cafe Marx," was colloquially renamed" the Cafe Max," after Horkheimer, and entered into what Martin Jay considers "the time of its greatest impact."

Horkheimer himself entered into his own period of glory. Still director of the Institute, he was elected Dean of Frankfurt University and a year later its Rector. When his tenure as Rector ended, he was awarded Frankfurt's highest honor, the Goethe Prize, and when on retiring to Switzerland, the city also made him an honorary citizen for life. As Rector, he had appeared frequently on television, and even hobnobbed with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, an irony since Marcuse and other Critical Theorists working with the U.S. occupation had worked mightily to prevent Adenauer and other anti-Nazi German conservatives from entering into postwar politics. Horkheimer maintained contact with the University of Chicago as a part-time lecturer, and was appointed "foreign consultant" by the Library of Congress.

There was really no need for continuing the Frankfurt School in America. Its "alumni" had planted both themselves and Critical Theory in much of academia, each bringing with him a small colony of like-minded educrats who proceeded to corrupt and "dumb down" education. Press and other mass communications (radio and television being foremost) had been thoroughly indoctrinated in what had come to be called "liberalism." A small brigade of those in government so oriented, in league with ambiguous politicians, gave the Critical Theorists aid and cover so that only a handful received any attention from congressional investigators—though all complained mightily against McCarthyism, tarring anti-Communists as being kin to Fascists and Nazis. And Herbert Marcuse busily incited his followers to violence.

In a few short decades, neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian Critical Theorists had changed America's cultural face and brought its civilization low. The optimism and the openness of the American character had been replaced by *kulturpessimismus.* The bile which ran in Karl Marx's veins was injected into America's bloodstream subtly and carefully. As the nation entered the third millennium, the heedless immorality, the obscenity of language, the destructiveness and violence rife in films and TV, and the degradation

of education were not the worst offenses of the Frankfurt School. The worst was a criminal philosophy which enshrined the hedonistic and nihilistic doctrine that there was no such thing as truth or moral law, that everyone was a law unto himself, that men and women had no responsibilities and no obligations to each other or to their communities. The only "truth" permitted was that God was Satan, irrelevant, or non-existent and that the be-all and end-all of existence were sexual intercourse and hallucinogens.

No nation and no society can continue to exist under these beliefs, particularly a nation and a society which is no longer able to read or to hold ideas. Consider once more the sex-education legacy of Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, the Frankfurt School, and the National Education Association. In the 1930s and 1940s, before sex "education" had become compulsive and compulsory, sexual intercourse in the mid-teens was rare and frowned upon. By 1988, a study showed, 11 percent of girls said that they had sex before age 15. By 1995, that number was 19 percent. By 2000, few were interested in the pandemic count.

It has not been the United States alone. Germany has its Green Party, environmentalist trumpet Marcusian violence, which seeks to sabotage and degrade the country's standard of living—and then passed it on to America. And the British have their Tavistock Institute, ally and ideological blood-brother of the Franklin School. Peter Hitchens, broadcaster and *Daily Express* columnist, offers an incisive overview of cultural trends in his *Abolition of Britain.* He begins by quoting Tony Blair's words in 1997: "I am a modern man. I am part of the rock and roll generation—the Beatles, color TV, that's the generation I come from." This, for Hitchens encapsulates the difference between the old Britain and the new. He focuses on the loss of British restraint and common sense and the rise of New Left exhibitionism—on patriotism, religion, family values, television and the "arts," pornography, marriage and illegitimacy, the dumbing down of education, and the "rather low" standards of hygiene. Yet in ascribing this to "liberalism" and cultural amnesia, he does not realize that what he describes did not just come about, it was planned—and not by the Beatles.

For these United States, the cost has been far greater, and a prelude to terror. The best Intelligence is that the onslaught that we label 9/11 would never have come about had the Islamic ter-

rorists not been convinced that the conspiracy of the Critical Theorists had left Americas feeble and foolish—that it would never have the moral strength to respond. Respond America did, to the shock of its enemies.

There was enough of the spirit which had made this nation great to act decisively. The concluding chapter has yet to be written.

★ ★ ★

Bibliography & Sources

Adorno, Theodor, et al. *The Authoritarian Personality.* Harper. 1950.

Barzun, Jacques. *Darwin, Marx, Wagner.* University of Chicago Press. 1981.

Brown, Arthur and MacDonald, Charles. *On A Field of Red.* Putnam. 1981

Berle, A.A. *Navigating the Rapids.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1973.

Billingsley, Kenneth L. *Hollywood Party.* Forum. 1998.

Chambers, Whittaker. *Witness.* Random House. 1952.

Clay, Lucius B. *Decision in Germany.* Doubleday. 1950.

Costello, John and Oleg Tsarev. *Deadly Illusions.* Crown. 1993.

Costello, John. *The Mask of Treachery.* Morrow. 1988.

Dos Passos, John. *The Fourteenth Chronicle.* Gambit. 1973.

Fischer, Ruth. *Stalin and German Communism.* Harvard University Press. 1948.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Basic Writings.* Modern Library. 1995.

Groves, Leslie R. *Now It Can Be Told.* Harper. 1962.

Gouzenko, Igor. *The Iron Curtain.* Dutton. 1948.

Hemingway, Ernest. *Selected Letters: 1971–1961.* Scribner.

Hook, Sidney. *Out of Step.* Harper & Row. 1987.
Hohne, Heinz. *Codeword: Direktor.* Secker & Warburg. 1971.
Horowitz, David. *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique.* University of Massachusetts Press. 1998.
Hayes, John L. and Klehr, Harvey. *Venona.* Yale University Press. 1999.

Johnson, Paul. *Modern Times.* Harper & Row. 1983.
Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination.* University of California Press. 1996.

Katz, Barry. *Herbert Marcuse and the Art of Liberation.* Verso. 1982.
Katz, Barry. *Foreign Intelligence.* Harvard University Press. 1989.
Krivitsky, Walter G. *In Stalin's Secret Service.* Harper's. 1939.
Koch, Stephen. *Double Lives.* Free Press. 1994.
Klehr, Harvey, et al. *The Secret World of American Communism.* Yale University Press. 1995.

Marx, Karl. *Early Writings.* Vintage Books. 1975.
Massing, Hede. *This Deception.* Duell, Sloan & Pearce. 1951.
Mahl, Thomas E. *Desperate Deception.* Brassey's. 1998.

Orwell, George. *Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell.* Harcourt, Brace & World. 1968.

Pincher, Chapman. *Their Trade Is Treachery.* Sidgwick & Jackson. 1981.
Pearson, Michael. *The Sealed Train.* Putnam. 1975.
Page, Bruce. *The Philby Conspiracy.* Doubleday. 1968.

Rees, David. *Harry Dexter White.* Coward, McCann & Geoghegan. 1973.
Ryskind, Morrie. *I Shot An Elephant.* Huntington House Publishers. 1994.

Strauss, Lewis. *Men and Decisions.* Doubleday. 1962.
Souvarine, Boris. *Stalin.* Longmans, Green & Co. 1939.
Sudoplatov, Pavel. *Special Tasks.* Little, Brown. 1994.
Simon, Julian. *Hoodwinking the Nation.* Transaction. 1999.

Toledano, Ralph de. *Spies, Dupes & Diplomats.* Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 1952.
Toledano,Ralph de. *Lament for a Generation.* Farrar, Straus and Cudahy. 1960.
The Sorge Confession. U.S. Army Intelligence Report.

West, Rebecca. *The New Meaning of Treason.* Viking Press. 1964.
Wright, Peter. *Spycatcher.* Viking. 1987.
Whymant, R. *Stalin's Spy-Richard Sorge.* St. Martin's Press. 1998.
Wiggershaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School.* MIT Press. 1994.
Weyl, Nathaniel. *Karl Marx, Racist.* Arlington House. 1997.

Hearings, Files, and Official Reports

Senate Internal Security Subcommittee
Canadian Royal Commission
Grey Board (Oppenheimer)
House Committee on Un-American Activities
Australian Royal Commission

Interviews, Conversations, Correspondence

Raymond Murphy (State Department Security Officer)
Ruth Fischer, (ex-general secretary, German Communist Party)
Ralph Bates (Spanish War correspondent)
Hede Massing (former Soviet agent)
Elizabeth Bentley (former NKVD courier)
Clifford Forster (former special counsel, ACLU)
Willi Schlamm (former editor, *Die Rote Fahne*)
Robert Morris (ONI & Senate committee counsel)
Carlo Tresca (anarchist, editor, *Il Martello*)
Richard Nixon
J. Edgar Hoover (director, FBI)
Louis B. Nichols (assoc. director, FBI)
Boris Souvarine (historian)
Isaac Don Levine (author, journalist)
Max Eastman (author, editor)
Ferdinand Lundberg (author, newsman)
Stefan Possony (political analyst)
Benjamin Gitlow (former official, CPUSA)
Alexander Kerensky (former prime minister of Russia)

Eugene Lyons (editor, foreign correspondent)
John A. Clements (Hearst executive, Marine intelligence)
Roy Brewer (Hollywood union leader)
Thomas Dodd (Nuremberg prosecutor, U.S. Senator)
Robert Humphreys, (editor, political analyst)
Suzanne LaFollette (editor, writer)
Adolphe Menjou (actor, political activist)
Herbert Hoover
Adm. Lewis Strauss (AEC chairman)
Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers (Gen. MacArthur staff)
Victor Riesel (editor, columnist)
Morrie Ryskind (Screen writer, columnist)
Nathaniel Weyl (Mensa, author)
Brig.Gen. Alexander Barmine (ex-Soviet intelligence officer, VOA)
John Hammond (jazz entrepreneur)
J. B. Matthews (researcher, archivist)
Ronald Reagan (President)
Jay Lovestone (ex-Communist Party leader, AFL)
Gen. Pierre de Benouville (Free French forces, Assemblé Nationale)
Ogden Reid Jr. (editor, *New York Herald-Tribune*, MC)
Ambassador William C. Bullitt
Alice R. Longworth
Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer
Lt. Igor Gouzenko (ex-Soviet Intelligence)
Douglas Bazata (OSS, CIA)
Richard Rovere (*New Masses, New Yorker*)
Norman Thomas (Socialist Party leader)
Karl Wittfogel (co-founder, Frankfurt School)
Harold Lavine (*PM, Newsweek*)
Sidney Hook (philospher, political activist)
Benjamin Stolberg (author, journalist)
Charles A. Pearce (ex-OSS, publisher)
Raymond Moley (FDR brain-trust, *Newsweek*)
Kenneth Crawford (*PM, Newsweek*)
Boris Nicolaevsky (archivist)
Victor Serge (ex-Soviet official, writer)
Julian Gorkin (POUM leader)

[APPENDIX I]

Annotated Bibliography on the Frankfurt School

The Twentieth Century was the period in which psychiatry, psychoanalysis, sociology, and neo-Marxist ideology and activism joined forces with the media—press, film, radio, and television—and with academia, to synchronize mass psycho-cultural manipulation on an unprecedented scale. Writers such as Aldous Huxley, H. G. Wells, and Bertrand Russell wrote novels and "scholarly" works extolling social engineering and the use of drugs and other pharmacological methods to bring about mass social transformation. Yet very few works have been published that take up the questions: Was such a concerted effort at mass psycho-cultural warfare actually carried out; who was responsible; how it was carried out; and how successful was it?

Any serious study of these questions must begin with a focus on two institutions—the Institute for Social Research (known as the Frankfurt School) and the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations in England. The Tavistock Institute is known mainly to senior sociologists and psychiatrists, in education and social psychology, as a cousin of the Frankfurt School. The Frankfurt School is better known as a result of a series of books which give a historical account of its founding and influence in the development of Critical Theory, its impact on education and communications, deconstructionism, and political correctness.

From the outset, the Institute attempted to conceal its Comintern roots and its connections. But its apparatus, throughout its history, never abandoned a fundamental commitment to wage psycho-cultural warfare, guided by the teachings of the early Marx as amalgamated with neo-Freudianism, against Western civilization and the destruction of Judeo-Christian culture to the point where they could be preempted by Marxist slavery. Up to this point, the Frankfurt School historiography and the analysis of its ideology and doctrines has been written by loyalists—and most of that output by its own members or advocates—which gives it an easy bias and a de-emphasis of its more virulent and shocking aspects.

The Library of Congress catalogue cites over 150 books under the subject heading "Frankfurt School". A name search of the School's leading figures—Max Horkheimer, Erich Fromm, Herbert Marcuse Theodor Adorno, etc.—turns up approximately another 1,000 titles—biographies, literary commentaries, and the writings of the Frankfurt School's members and associates. There is virtually no objective or critical analysis available)

AUTHOR: Anderson, Walter Truit.
TITLE: *The Upstart Spring: Esalen and the American Awakening*
PUBLISHER: Addison-Wesley, 1983

A useful account of a critical institution within the Frankfurt School-Tavistock periphery in the U.S. Esalen was founded as a West Coast hub of the "humanistic" psychology movement. Its founders were "inspired" to launch the "new age" counter-culture think tank after meeting with Aldous Huxley and with psychedelic drug pioneer Gerald Heard. Virtually every West Coast counter-culture icon played a role in the Esalen programs, which consisted of sensitivity training, weekend seminars, and free-love group sex experiments. Abraham Maslow and Rollo May, founders of the "humanistic psychology" movement, were closely involved in Esalen, as were prominent Frankfurt School and Tavistock figures such as Herbert Marcuse and R.D. Laing.

AUTHOR: Bottomore, T.B.
TITLE: *The Frankfurt School*
PUBLISHER: Tavistock Institute, 1984

Bottomore, a professor of sociology at Sussex University and its Tavistock Institute affiliate, identifies the phases of the Frankfurt School and Critical Theory. The 1923-1933 phase, the most overtly Marxist, covers the period when the Frankfurt School was still headquartered in Germany. The 1933-1950 phase, during which most of the Frankfurt School moved to America and Columbia University, fearful that its Comintern connections would lead to Nazi concentration camps, was its expansion period, when it virtually took over the direction of American education and the media, and wartime U.S. operations in Germany. In the 1950-1970 period, the Frankfurt School dominated the New Left, the Black Panthers, the student counterculture movement in the U.S. and in Europe launched the "environmentalist" movement and the Green Party, and assumed the ideological control of the social sciences. Bottomore assigns the leadership of these activities to Herbert Marcuse.

AUTHOR: Steinberg, Jeffrey
TITLE: Draft Report, "Crisis in American Education"

An 88-page manuscript that traces the present crisis in American education and mass culture to the Frankfurt School "invasion" of the U.S. The paper provides detailed information and analysis on the "mission" of the Frankfurt School to spread *kulturpessimismus* as a means of destroying Western culture and Judeo-Christian moral values. It focuses on the three most important figures in the psycho-cultural war: George Lukacs, the Comintern official who founded the Frankfurt School; John Dewey who brought the Frankfurt School to Columbia University and then spread its ideas throughout the education system; and Kurt Lewin, who pioneered techniques in group brainwashing (i.e. "sensitivity training") Most significant is the Frankfurt School role in creating the "new education" which attacked cognitive learning and the imposed the dictatorship of political correct" values.

AUTHOR: Jay, Martin
TITLE: *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School*
PUBLISHER: Little, Brown & Co., 1973

Martin Jay, a protégé of the Frankfurt School's leadership, is an unabashed advocate. However, he provides the first detailed account of the Marxian-Freudian nature of his subject. He was given access to otherwise unavailable material, and his book is an invaluable source of information, however biased it may be. A history of the School, however, cites it as "independent" and carefully omits mention of any connection between the School and both the Comintern control and its association with Soviet foreign intelligence operations. Despite his failure also to include the operations of the Frankfurt School in what it called "the culture industry"—Hollywood, TV, and mass communication, the book, along with Jay's *The Permanent Exiles,* are an entry point in an understanding of Critical Theory and its impact.

AUTHOR: Marrow, Alfred Jay
TITLE: *The Practical Theorist: The Life & Work of Kurt Lewin*
PUBLISHER: Basic Books, 1969

The only comprehensive biography of one of the key figures in the Frankfurt School/Tavistock assault. Lewin was one of the more important bridge figures between the Frankfurt School apparatus, the Tavistock Institute, and the Deweyite networks in the U.S. That he was a major part of the infiltration of OSS and Naval Intelligence is a chilling fact. A founder of the National Training Laboratories at MIT, Lewin created the apparatus which transformed the entire area of sociology and psychology in schools, the work place, and vulnerable religious institutions.

AUTHOR: Wiggerhaus, Rolfe
TITLE: *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance*
PUBLISHER: The MIT Press, 1994

By far, the most comprehensive single volume, an "official" history of the Frankfurt School, written by a loyalist. Wiggerhaus was given access to sealed archives and personal papers of Frankfurt School director Max Horkheimer and other important Critical Theorists. Based on the Georg Lukacs archives, Wiggerhaus fills

out the story of the founding of the Frankfurt School as a project of the Comintern. He also details the role of the Princeton Radio Research Project, an early and successful Frankfurt School drive to subvert the American mass culture industry and to develop a strategy to take it over as a vehicle for social control. He also makes a compelling case for the enduring impact of the School's subversion of American academia and the culture at large.

AUTHOR: Adorno, Theodor
TITLE: *The Authoritarian Personality*
PUBLISHER: Harper, 1950.
Discussed at length in Prelude to Terror.

AUTHOR: Adorno, Theodor and Horkheimer, Max
TITLE: *Dialectic of Enlightenment*
PUBLISHER: Herder & Herder, 1972
Perhaps the most important theoretical work of the Frankfurt School, leading one critic to remark that Marxism raised anti-Semitism to global levels. The authors believed that the tragedy of World War II could be exploited to force a comprehensive "re-education" of American and European peoples in an anti-Judeo-Christian world-view leading to mass social engineering.

AUTHOR: Cooper, David (editor)
TITLE: *To Free a Generation: The Dialectics of Liberation*
PUBLISHER: Penguin Books (U.K.), 1968
A collection of speeches delivered at the Tavistock Institute's two-week Congress in 1968, during the urban ghetto riots in the U.S. and just prior to the riot at the Democratic Convention in Chicago. Nails down the ties between the Tavistock Institute and the Frankfurt School.

AUTHOR: Goodman, Paul
TITLE: *Growing Up Absurd: Problems of Youth in the Organized System*
PUBLISHER: Random House, 1960
An example of the popular literature produced by the Frankfurt School and it allies. Goodman argued American culture was demoralized and destructive, and that the "youth revolts" of the

Beats and their fellow juveniles were a healthy rebellion against a sick society. Along with John Dewey, he provided an important bridge between Critical Theory and public education.

AUTHOR: Hook Sidney
TITTLE: *From Hegel to Marx*
PUBLISHER: Columbia University Press, 1994

Hook's essays are based on Karl Korsch's 1920s lectures at the founding of the Frankfurt School, which he attended. Although Hook later emerged as one of America's leading anti-Communist intellectuals, he never shed his Marxist-Hegelian bias and his Deweyite philosophy, and his attempts to "re-invent" Marx as a "classical humanist" are both saddening and mystifying.

AUTHOR: Lewin, Kurt
TITLE: *Field Theory in Social Science*
PUBLISHER: Harper, 1951

Published posthumously, this work sets out the methodological foundations of Lewin's work. Highly technical, it is required reading to understand how he shaped the course of social psychology.

AUTHOR: Lukacs, Georg
TITLE: *History & Class Consciousness*
PUBLISHER: MIT Press, 1971

Written in 1923, this work broke ground for "cultural Marxism," and established the founder of the Frankfurt School as its theoretical leader. Lukacs rejected orthodox Marxist-Leninist ideology, and created the foundation for revolutionary struggle which became the core of Critical Theory.

AUTHOR: Herbert Marcuse
TITLE: *One Dimensional Man*
PUBLISHER: Beacon Press, 1964

Along with Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization,* this was the Bible for the New Left movement, the Black Panthers, SDS, and the other "rebel" groups" in the U.S. and Europe in the 1960s. As the guru of the drug/rock/sex/revolution counterculture of the 1960s, Marcuse's book serves as a guide to their violent underpinnings.

AUTHOR: Rees, John Rawlings
TITLE: *The Shaping of Psychiatry By War*
PUBLISHER: Norton, 1945

Rees was a founder of the Tavistock Institute and Clinic in London, the leading British neo-Marxist-neo-Freudian indoctrination center which during the war was recruited by the British military to the direct its Psychiatric Division. Rees spells out the Institute's vision of a future world dominated by "mobile teams of psychiatric shock troops" to regulate the social order. He calls for "social psychiatry" to control society.

AUTHORS: Trist, Eric and Murray, Hugh
TITLE: *The Social Engagement of Social Science: A Tavistock Anthology*
PUBLISHER: University Pennsylvania Press, 1990-1997

A two-volume collection of the works of the leading figures of Tavistock. Highly technical and in some cases unreadable for the non-initiate. It includes a sanitized "official history" of the Institute, demonstrating its tremendous influence on British Military intelligence, the Home Office, and other government services.

AUTHOR: Jacoby, Russell
TITLE: *The Repression of Psychoanalysis: The Political Freudians*
PUBLISHER: University of Chicago Press, 1983

One of the least known books on the subject of Marxism and the Freudians, it should be considered one of the key rsource books on how neo-Marxism-neo-Freudianism penetrated American society.

AUTHOR: Katz, Barry
TITLE: *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in OSS, 1942-45*
PUBLISHER: Harvard University Press, 1989

Discussed in this work. The chapter, The Frankfurt School Goes to War presents an examination of how the Frankfurt School shaped the intelligence evaluations of the U.S. government during World War II, and demonstrates how important U.S. intelligence estimates, particularly on Germany, were set by the Frankfurt School.

AUTHOR: Kleiner, Art
TITLE: *Age of Heretics: Heroes, Outlaws and the Forerunners of Corporate Change*
PUBLISHER: Doubleday, 1996

A history of the successful efforts during the 1950s and 1960s by the National Training Labs, the Esalen Institute, and the Tavistock Institute, and other offshoots of the Frankfurt School, to penetrate the corporate sector. It also details how the Tavistock/Frankfurt apparatus got inside the U.S. National Security establishment, including the White House, the Defense Department, and all the intelligence agencies (such as the CIA's illegal program) involved in mind control and drug experimentation.

[APPENDIX II]

A Weather Underground Manifesto

The Weather Underground, along with the Black Panthers and other terrorist groups, was spawned by the Frankfurt School through the writings, preachments, and efforts of Herbert Marcuse, one of the Schools most effective members. The following manifesto, here abridged, was written by Celia Sojourn and Billy Ayres.

> The only path to the final defeat of imperialism is revolutionary war. Revolution is the most powerful resource of the people. Without mass struggle there can be no revolution. Without armed struggle there can be no victory. —*Prairie Fire*

There are many on the left who righteously condemn all violence of revolutionaries. . . . For these people, the revolution will happen only some day and hopefully be made by somebody else. But power concedes nothing without a demand. Armed struggle is an extension of political struggle, just as war is politics with bloodshed. . . . When a small ruling class maintains itself in power by force and violence, when the masses of people are forces to work and live in brutalized and violent conditions, political violence is the inevitable result. . . .

[Violence] is a monopoly of the US state. It is woven into the very the very fabric of capitalism, in Rap Brown's words, as Amer-

ican as cherry pie... Capitalism is a violent system, having at its center the violent relationship of exploiter and exploited, a relationship of oppression and constant struggle. Under capitalism, armies of women are forced into prostitution. Black people's life expectancy is ten years less than that of white folks. Old people are discarded after they've worked away the better part of their lives. The status quo is murder. Reactionary capitalist violence is criminal: revolutionary violence will bring about the new society. . . . Marx considered violence as "the midwife of all old societies about to bring forth a new one." The capitalist system of private property is protected forcibly by a group of violent, dangerous men. . . .

Armed struggle can inspire and organize, carry on the tradition of resistance and train fighters for fighting. . . . For the seizure of power from the imperialists, armed struggle will be the decisive. . . . Resistance to the Vietnam war included thousands of people who participated in military protests, clandestine or armed actions against warmakers, burning draft boards, destroying corporate or military files. Sabotage grew and spread through the armed forces. Bombings of war-related targets . . . built the popular movement: the bombing of power lines into defense plants in Colorado in 1968, the bombings in New York in 1969, the destruction of [an Army research center] in Madison in 1970, and the bombing of the Capitol and the Pentagon by the Weather Underground. . . .

Revolutionary armed struggle is . . . a sign of maturity in our movement. . . . Although the guerrilla forces are decentralized . . . we are united in our spirit of love for the people of the world . . . and determination to make revolutions by every means necessary.

We are at an early stage of a protracted revolutionary war. We need strategy to last, to grow and organize for many years to come, a strategy to preserve and expand our forces and political movement, a strategy for study as well as training, tactical retreat as well as escalation. . . . Action which is advanced should pull forward the people's understand of the enemy and people's willingness to fight. . . . Our goal is to build communist organization toward the stage where armed struggle becomes a mass phenomenon led by a Marxist-Leninist party: a revolutionary stage.

The strategic necessity for this period is to mobilize the oppressed and exploited people against the US . . . Vietnam teaches us that in revolutionary war firepower is only one factor, and not the key in determining who wins and who loses Consciousness is decisive.

The bombing of the State Department by the [Weather Underground] in January 1975 is one example of effective integration of military and political struggle. . . . The attack on Manhattan District Attorney Frank Hogan's armed guard was built on years of demonstrations against that corrupt tyrant who was responsible for the unjust imprisonment of thousands of Black people. . . . All these actions represent the effective combination of military and political struggles. . . . While the state is computerizing and centralizing its repressive apparatus, it is also subject to major setbacks which the left should be organizing and pushing. Watergate was one of these. Other factors hold back the full force of the state—mass consciousness of government illegality, suspicion of informers, the power of a strong non-collaborationist stand in the face of grand juries. . . . The criterion of a good action [by revolutionaries] is the damage it does to the state, the toll that can be taken, the felt blow. . . .

We do not condemn violence [against the state] that originates from the left. . . . It is a right wing error to argue that only legal means of struggle are legitimate. . . . This idea plays into the state's strategy to separate out the warriors from the other parts of the revolutionary movement. . . . Our revolution will need both open and clandestine movements, legal and illegal struggle, peaceful and armed struggle [to reach] the goal of a revolutionized and fighting people.

(This derives directly from Marcusian doctrine.)

[APPENDIX III]

George Orwell on the Liberal/Left Intellectuals

Review of Alfred Noyes' *Edge of the Abyss*

His thesis is that Western civilization is in danger of actual destruction and that it has been brought to this pass not by economic maladjustments but by the decay of the belief in absolute good and evil [and] the doubt cast by various totalitarian states on the very existence of objective truth ... Mr. Noyes is also within his rights in saying that the intelligentsia are more affected by totalitarian ideas than the common people, and are partly to blame for the mess we are now in ... Then there is the question of the amount of blame attaching to the "highbrows" for the breakdown of moral standards. The "highbrows are obscene, they attack religion, patriotism, the family, etc. etc. (They are, so it appears, in some way responsible for the rise of Hitler.)

Fascism

As used, the word "fascism" is almost entirely meaningless. I have heard it applied to farmers, shopkeepers, Social Credit, corporal punishment, fox-hunting, bull-fighting ... Kipling, Gandhi, Chiang Kai-shek, homosexuality, J.B. Priestley broadcasts, youth hostels, astrology, women, dogs, and I don't know what else. But fascism is a political and economic system. Why then cannot we have a clear and generally accepted definition.

Review of Franz Borkenau's *The Totalitarian Enemy*

The assumption made on both sides was that National Socialism was simply capitalism with the lid off. ... proved in many a pamphlet by John Styracery and tacitly accepted by the London *Times*. Then came the eye-opener of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. Thereafter the Strachey-*Times* thesis became untenable. National Socialism *is* a form of socialism, *is* emphatically revolutionary. ... The Soviet and Nazi regimes ... are rapidly looking towards the same system, a form of oligarchical collectivism. ... If Hitler falls, Germany may go Bolshevik because of Hitler and not in spite of him.

Anti-fascist?

One feature of the Nazi conquest of France was the astonishing defections among the left-wing political intelligentsia. They squeal the loudest against fascism and yet a respectable proportion collapse into defeatism when the pinch comes.

July 1940

Communists are allowed to abandon "the line" when clinging to it would mean extinction.

1943

The English intelligentsia worship Stalin because they have lost their patriotism and religious belief without losing the need for a god and a fatherland. Many of them would transfer their allegiance to Hitler if Germany won.

Beliefs

What do we achieve by getting rid of such primal things as patriotism and religion? You have not got rid of the need for *something to believe*. The Communists have something to believe in. Patriotism, religion, empire, military glory—all in one word—Russia. Father, king, hero—all in one word—Stalin. The devil—Hitler. Heaven—Moscow. Hell—Berlin. ... The intellectuals can swallow totalitarianism *because* they have no experience of anything but liberalism.

[APPENDIX IV]

John Dewey and Permanent Revolution

Review by Professor M.D. Aeschliman of Henry T. Edmondson's *John Dewey & the Decline of American Education: How the Patron Saint of Schools Has Corrupted Teaching and Learning*

The 19th-century common-school movement, which we rightly associated with Horace Mann (1796-1859), was a logical, organic outgrowth of the educational thinking and political institutions of the American Founders, especially Jefferson and Franklin. But as historians and education policy specialists have suggested, this common sense legacy was subsequently mixed with ambiguous, Romantic-utopian, even messianic ideas that reach critical mass in the "Progressive" movement of the 1920s and 1930s whose animating spirit was John Dewey ...

Such anti-traditional, utopian expectations—which Governor Morris had ridiculed in 1790 as "French" lightning as opposed to sober American "light"—had little consequence in the 19th and early 20th centuries on so decentralized an education system as ours. But the advocacy of Romantic, naturalistic, and pantheistic religious-philosophical ideas by alluring writers such as Rousseau, Emerson, and Whitman created ideals and expectations that were to find their most influential educational proponents by the 1890s in John Dewey. Eschewing our existing institutions and what he called the "idolatry of the U.S. Constitution," Dewey promoted a futuristic, socialistic idea of "the Great Community,"

whose "seer" was the polymorphous, promiscuous, egalitarian egotist-aesthete Walt Whitman...

Democracy, Dewey wrote, "is a name for a life of free and enriching communion," and this mystical, pantheistic idea had its institutional vehicle in the "child-centered" school. As Charles Glenn, Richard Hofstadter, and others, including admirers of Dewey, have noted, Dewey actually had no trust in or loyalty to existing democratic institutions that affected schools, such as school boards or elections of public officials. And as his complimentary 1928 comments on what he saw in Communist Russia indicate, he had no commitment to the rights or virtues of traditional families either.

The American Founders, and several generations of their sensible successors responsible for an eventually free but mandatory public-education system, emphasized the fundamental importance of providing equal access at least at a minimum level for all children to traditional curricular components—literacy, numeracy, science, geography, and history, the funded wisdom of many centuries of human endeavor that was now available in books. But under the Romantic primitivists such as Rousseau, Emerson, and Whitman, the historical fund of knowledge and skill made available in books to those who were literate was increasingly held in contempt.

"I hate books!" Rousseau expostulates in the middle of his interminably long, boring sophistical, but immensely influential education-theory book, *Emile* (1762). And the writers Emerson and Whitman evince the same counterintuitive contempt for their own *métier,* in the interests of an ill-defined but pantheistic conception of "nature." Dewey was thus building on a budding barbarian impulse, impatient and contemptuous of the study and transmission of accumulated history and literate traditions to the classical-Christian and moderate-Enlightenment traditions of the Founding Fathers and their immediate successors down to Lincoln.

Quentin Anderson has described Dewey's resulting "child-centered," primitivist "conception of the school" as "the most extravagant and nationally influential of his fantasies." This school is a present-oriented, limited-literacy, "experiential" tool for the "reconstruction of society"... The 80-year dominance of Dew-

ey's "Progressive" ideas-almost indelibly institutionalized in the world of teachers' colleges, teachers' unions, and certification procedures—has been a gross failure in terms of the educational levels and competences of our public-school graduates.

"Standards-based" education reforms at the state level and the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, whatever their defects or difficulties, are well-warranted responses by parents, citizens, and legislators to generations of scholastic decline that have left many of our children and young adults not only functionally incompetent and quasi-illiterate but also vulnerable to an unprecedented tide of polluted cultural effluvia. The "child-centered school" has helped give birth to an infantile culture—one that threatens the very capacity of the American republic to retain and convey its economic accomplishments, social decencies, and civic self-understanding.

Like many thoughtful and liberally educated critics of Dewey, Henry Edmondson is puzzled and depressed at how widespread and long-lasting his influence has proved to be, given the turgid, confusing quality of both thought and his prose, his logic and his rhetoric ... Edmondson's critique of Dewey is clear and brief. He rightly sees Rousseau's primitivism as a major influence, and he rightly distinguishes Dewey from Jefferson, whose reputation and lineage Dewey was eager to claim as his own. Edmondson is eager to show how decisively Dewey departs and differs from the heritage of Jefferson and the other Founders on the questions of the centrality of literacy and history in the American K-12 curriculum: Dewey and his disciples and allies promoted "hands-on" experience and "social studies" as against literacy and study of history. In addition, Dewey's promotion of what he called "social experimentation leading to great social change" was a working out of Whitman's social, psychological, and sexual radicalism and egalitarianism.

Dewey decently defended Trotsky against the Stalinists in the late 1930s—perhaps his finest hour—but his own version of the need for "permanent revolution" has had *more of a long-lasting and insidious effect than Trotsky's, creating a climate for novelty, change, and experimentation in American public education—uncritical "neophilia" and what Frederick Hess has called bogus "policy churn."* Dewey slandered a wide range of more conservative or traditional-

ist education-policy thinkers as "fundamentalists" obsessed with a fruitless, retrograde "quest for certainty." In this regard, he is *the father of our contemporary "post-modern" deconstructionists, with their attacks on "foundationalism" and "logocentrism".* But some of the most powerful and enduring criticism on the whole "Progressive" movement of which Dewey is the patron saint came early from thoughtful and liberal-traditionalist Columbia Teachers College professors as W.C. Bagley and Isaac L. Kandel. [Emphasis added.]

A Jewish immigrant writing in a dark time, Kandel knew that Dewey's influential denial of history, traditional learning, and moral common sense in teacher training and the schools was a new form of barbarism. We are living with the consequences.

© 2006 by National Review Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Notes

1. As explained to me by Ruth Fischer, whose expertise was gained by direct experience, "the terms Soviet agent, Comintern agent, Soviet spy, GPU, NKVD, MGB, GRU, etc. have caused some confusion. The underground and espionage functions of these individuals and groups evolved according to events, but in Tsarist times were usually kept separate. For political activities there was the Ochrana, dealing with enemies of the state-anarchists, nihilists, Marxists, and other revolutionists. What we could strictly call military intelligence operated in a kind of joint partnership with the Imperial German General Staff." Heinz Hoe describes it in *Codeword-Direktor*: "For years, the old established friendship between the service chiefs of Berlin and St. Petersburg had made military intelligence [almost a joint venture]. On the military intelligence level, this continued after the Russian Revolution, as the Imperial German General Staff organized and ran the Red Army. But after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, this changed. Felix Dzherzinski renamed the *Ochrana the Cheka*." Military intelligence became the 'Fourth Department' and then the GRU, the *Glavnoe Razvedyvatelnoe Uppravlene*. One of the conditions for the admission of a local Communist Party into the Communist International (the Comintern) was "to create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus"... All legal work must be carried out by the illegal part under full control of the Comintern. At times, agents for one of the *apparats* also worked for another, or there were joint operations, hence the confusion as to whether a participating agent was KGB, GRU, or Comintern. For example, Whittaker

Chambers had the rank of "colonel" in the GRU, but most of his work was for the NKVD.

2. The Hegelian exercise of the Frankfort School might perhaps be summed up in the response of Groucho, a later Marx, who when asked where he lived said in his most Hegelian manner, "I moved."
3. Bertold Brecht, an associate of the Frankfurt School and a collaborator with Weill, would later concur. "The mansions of culture," he said with his customary good taste, "are built on dogshit."
4. Horkheimer was more than an academic espousing Critical Theory. CIA, depending on OSS records not open to the general researcher, has clearly indicated that he was connected with the *Rote Kapelle* (the Red Orchestra), the Soviet Union's chief Intelligence operation in Germany, starting in the late 1920s and continuing through World War II. The *Rote Kapelle* was the German underground with which, as will be described later, Herbert Marcuse and the Frankfurt School coterie operated the OSS Central European desk, almost exclusively working through Noel Field.
5. Years later a slightly acerbic music critic remarked, "It's a pity Schoenberg didn't take that advice himself."
6. In the late Thirties and early Forties, Klemperer became part of the refugee-organized New Friends of Music in New York, which ignored Adorno and played Bach and Beethoven.
7. Like most other staff and members of the Frankfurt School, Hanns Eisler turned up in New York after Hitler took power. In the summer of 1939, he wrote the music for a Communist Party pageant, staged at Madison Square Garden by Jules Dassin, just before the announcement of the Hitler Stalin Pact. As a result of their work at the pageant, both Eisler and Dassin were snapped up by Hollywood. Dassin became a fugitive from the House Un-American Activities Committee investigation of Communist infiltration of Hollywood. Klemperer, a musician rather than a politician, was well received as a conductor at a concert series at New York's Town Hall in the early 1940s.
8. In the case of Werfel, there is an ironic sidebar. In 1938, when Whittaker Chambers was reestablishing an identity after his years in the *apparat*, he translated two books by Werfel from the German, the official language of the Comintern and of Soviet Intelligence

services. One was *Bambi* (which made millions for the book publisher and for Walt Disney, though Chambers only received $75 for his translation) and the other was *Class Reunion*, from which Alger Hiss's lawyers attempted to show that the "frame-up" of Hiss was taken.

9. Katz's role as a major NKVD and Comintern agent in the Spanish Civil war purges, includes supervising the Institute's work in England, France and America—and eventually his role in the attack on Trotsky in Mexico, and in the defenestration of Jan Masyrik.
10. One of his associates described him as "torturing and self-torturing, a wretched sighing hand-wringing misfit," and others simply dismissed him as "a nasty item"—but a brilliant though vicious manipulator of men.
11. Some social psychologists have seen this cruelty as symptomatic and characteristic of the sexual orientation of so many of the Bloomsbury and Cambridge coterie. There is some debate as to who invented the term, or perhaps it was spontaneous com-bustion, but contemplating them, Isaiah Berlin in London snorted, "Homintern," even as years later Ambassador William Bullitt would expostulate in Washington. It is ironic that Lyton Strachey's cult of homosexuality should have embraced the Comintern when many thousands of homosexuals were being subjected by Stalin to the horrors and certain death of slave-labor camps.
12. Malcolm Muggeridge once remarked of Rothschild that he "floundered between the Kremlin and the House of Lords."
13. W. H. Auden, a poet of great technique but adolescent content, wrote: "Communism offers a haven for the infantilists, and since it is perfectly possible for a highly intellectual individual to be an infantilist, it appears not surprising that a prominent English scientist should be a Communist and therefore, since every Communist is bound to regard disloyalty to his country as one of his Party duties, disloyal."
14. This kind of poll-loading was refined by the Institute and passed on to pollsters in later years, distorting the opinions and the attitudes of the body politic, "defining" personality traits, and justifying policies advocated by the media and the liberal/left Establishment.

15. A tradition at Columbia, during the tense and hot week which preceded final exams was the annual water riot in which students in the dormitories dropped water-filled paper containers out of their windows and then marched on Barnard College where they serenaded the girls and tore down the Barnard fence. In 1936, however, the Young Communist League guided the students to Dr. Butler's house, where he was entertaining a group of ancient alumni, and set up a chant which began as "Castigate Butler" but quickly became "Castrate Butler." The two leaders of the "demonstration" were given a choice: an apology to Dr. Butler or expulsion. One, the nephew of a Columbia trustee, chose to apologize and went on to the Yale Divinity School; the other, a Golden Gloves winner, showed up drunk before the faculty and was expelled.
16. The account goes that when Nicholas Murray Butler made his offer of affiliation with Columbia, Max Horkheimer feared that because of his limited English he had not understood him. Whereupon he wrote a long letter to Butler asking for confirmation and clarification. The answer from Butler's office in the Low Library was brief: "You have understood me perfectly."
17. Madeline Gilbert, a cousin of the Rockefellers but determinedly conservative, once remarked in a discussion of international bankers, "But of course, everybody knows that Nelson is a Communist."
18. Alfred Adler, who like the Reichians had moved away from Freud, asserted that the Jesuits were correct when they held that a child's "prototype" was decisively shaped by the age of five.
19. This was more than a little disingenuous, for Dewey's theories had been tested at the Lincoln School, run by Teacher's College, which had been so disastrous that it had been forced to shut down its doors in the 1940s.
20. It should be noted that at the time of the American Revolution, when the standard texts in every American home were the King James Bible and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the literacy rate in the Thirteen Colonies was more than 70 percent, very much higher than in England. In 1915, before the Hall-Dewey-Frankfurt School "reforms" had taken over American education, the U.S. Bureau of Education reported that only one out of every 1,000 children between the ages of 10-14 in Massachusetts was illiterate. In 1984,

after the Frankfurt School and the National Education Association had polluted teaching methods, the Boston *Globe* reported that "about 40 percent of the city's adult population [is] functionally illiterate." Those figures were dwarfed throughout the rest of the country as high schools began graduating yearly classes of students who functionally could neither read, write, or add—and eventually this spread into higher education.

21. Federal statutes enacted by a pusillanimous Congress are already in place to carry out this provision. In New York City a child was taken from school and placed in foster custody by "child protection authorities" without informing his parents except by certified mail, days after they had reported their child missing. In Kentucky and Missouri, social workers are assigned from a child's birth to monitor families accused as being "at risk" for child abuse or other problems. There are twelve criteria for judging whether a parent is "at risk" of being a child abuser: Does the parent smoke? Is the parent overweight? Does the child have too many or too few toys? Does the parent have traditional cultural and religious views?
22. By the Democratic convention, it had mustered one in eight of the delegates and was more potent than any other special-interest group, the largest single bloc at every Democratic convention since 1976.
23. A letter from a high school teacher to a parent, complaining about her son's bad spelling seen by this writer contained gross spelling errors—and this is not unusual.
24. The NEA is not only the nation's largest union but is the most powerful special-interest group in the Democratic Party, contributing uncounted and unaccountable million to the Party's campaign coffers. Its budget exceeds that of the entire AFL-CIO. After the 1976 election, Hamilton Jordan, President-elect Carter's campaign manager, boasted: "The massive support from teachers was crucial to our winning. We turned to the NEA for help [when badly sagging in the polls] and it delivered nationwide." "We are the biggest potential striking force in the country," said NEA President Catherine Barrett in 1972, "and we are determined to control the direction of education." "We must reorder Congressional; priorities by reordering Congress," said NEA President Helen Wise in 1974. "We will become the fore-

most political power in the nation," said NEA President John Ryor in 1978.

The NEA has run tens of thousands of teachers through "political action workshops"—in many cases giving them graduate-study credit, as if it were a university. Two decades ago, Terry Herndon, executive secretary of NEA, announced its goals: "To have leaders with sufficient clout to roam the halls of Congress and collect votes to reorder the priorities of the United States of America." In a neo-Marxist, neo-Freudian manner, he might have added.

In 1978, to give an example, the NEA pushed the public schools to hire an additional 177,000 teachers over the previous number, even though pupil registration had dropped by 2.7 million. At the same time, the NEA had been dictating curriculum through the Federal government, in line with the theories of Wilhlem Reich, Georg Lukacs, and the Frankfurt School. And, to preserve the jobs and salaries of incompetent members, it has fought tooth and nail against rewarding and advancing good teachers and shuffling off those who cannot pass exams in the subjects they are presumably teaching. As a result, high school and college graduates must be trained by their employers in what should have been taught them in elementary school. It is, of course, considered politically incorrect to note that a slumping education has been paralleled by a spectacular rise among students in violence, mayhem, murder, drug and alcohol addiction, and underage sexual abuse.

25. Other corroboration falls into what may perhaps be described as "oral history"—the many conversations this writer had over the years with Ruth Fischer, Karl Wittfogtel, Kerensky, Boris Souvarine, Boris Nicolaevsky, and others who were there or whose business it was to know what went on *there*.
26. Weill departed from the buzz-saw music demanded by Adorno and became a rich man, writing such scores as that of *Knickerbocker Holiday*, whose *September Song* (book and lyrics by the conservative Maxwell Anderson, and songs for such Broadway hits as *Lady in the Dark*, *One Touch of Venus* (lyrics by Ogden Nash), Max Reinhardt's *The Eternal Road* (lyrics by Franz Werfel), and of course *The Three Penny Opera*, the American version of Bertold Brecht's *Die Dreigroschenoper*.

27. In their wisdom, the lawmakers, the White House, and the media decided that the solution was a gaggle of gun laws—though existing laws on the books might have prevented some of the carnage. That the murderous drug-fed children were taught to do what the Frankfurt School and the NEA believed and demanded, all part of advanced "education" and "pharmacology." The "right to know" media studiously suppressed the fact that in states which have the least stringent gun laws, the rate of gun-inflicted homicide is the lowest, whereas New York and the District of Columbia, with the toughest laws, have led all the rest in murder and gun-inflicted violence.
28. It is interesting that the *New Leader*, with a tiny staff and small circulation, led in breaking important stories of Soviet, Nazi, Fascist, Communist, and pro-Axis activities which the major media missed. It is also significant that the *New York Times* followed up on these stories but always looked down its nose, to put it politely, at the weekly newspaper.
29. This writer recalls wryly his meeting with Bud Freeman, the great tenor saxophonist and good friend, after an absence of several years. "Ralph," Bud said sadly, "you've always loved people. How can you be for Barry Goldwater?" Or my old Columbia faculty adviser who refused to shake my hand because I had written "that vicious book about Alger Hiss."
30. General Groves, head of the Manhattan Project which created the A-bomb, told this writer after the war that he knew that J. Robert Oppenheimer was, as Groves put it, "a Red but since he was Jewish he wouldn't give any atomic secrets to the Nazis." And in all the efforts to force the Communists out of Los Alamos, Groves was half-hearted, fearful that he would lose "valuable" scientists.
31. Memo from Assistant Secretary of State A. A. Berle to Secretary of State Cordell Hull: "For your confidential information, the really active head of the intelligence section of Donovan's group [OSS] is Mr. Ellis, who is assistant to Mr. Stephenson. In other words, Stephenson's assistant in British intelligence is running Donovan's intelligence service." Interestingly, in his diaries, Berle made no mention of this confidential memo—just as he made no mention in his testimony at the Hiss trial of the notes of his interview with Whittaker Chambers in which he was informed of

Alger Hiss, Noel Field, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White, and others—notes which he attempted to deny but which he had, fortunately for the record, turned over to the FBI in 1943.

32. Among the highest-ranking of Soviet agents, his associate in espionage, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, would state almost verbatim when Elizabeth Bentley testified as to White: "His attitude was that I am going to help you [the NKVD and the GRU] but my right hand doesn't want to know what the left is doing." It would be interesting to ascertain which hand was doing what when he turned over to Soviet occupation authorities the plates for U.S. occupation money, which the Kremlin reprinted by the millions of dollars and which the U.S. had to pay off.
33. Little was ever done about Mary Price, since it was considered unmanly to go after women spies. In this writer's Newsweek years, Raymond Moley mentioned two such female operatives, the identity of which was no secret to me, suggesting that I do some further digging, and then he said, "To what point? We'll only get kicked in the teeth for bringing up the subject."
34. Murphy was fully aware of Welles's "sexual orientation" problems, about which he could do nothing. In 1949, when Welles had a nervous breakdown and was found wandering in the woods subsequent to the defenestration of Laurence Duggan, beloved of the Undersecretary, who had been scheduled to testify before HUAC and had agreed to tell all about Alger Hiss and the Soviet secret services. At the time, Murphy told this writer: "We knew that Welles was too close to Currie and White, and that he was blabbing to White's German experts in OSS, but we could do nothing. Hull's protests were always brushed aside by FDR who considered him a hill-billy, and anything I said was ignored as coming from a Roman Catholic bigot." Murphy was also on the White-House "drop-dead" list because in 1943, he had interviewed Whittaker Chambers and had attempted to get the Alger Hiss record past Welles, Dean Acheson, and Currie to Roosevelt. The FBI had already tried and failed.
35. In this case, White & Co. did not prevail. In 1941, as noted, he had been among those who pressured FDR, against the opposition of Cordell Hull and Secretary of War Henry Stimson, to reject a *modus vivendi* with Japan which would have prevented the Pacific

War. White had been instrumental in the appointment of Communist-liner Owen Lattimore as chief U.S. adviser to Chiang Kai-shek and had falsely "explained" the terms of the *modus vivendi* to Chiang, who then opposed it, much to the satisfaction of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

36. Among those seeds, from an article in the Winter 1943 issue of Public Opinion Quarterly: "[Fascism] is deeply rooted, particularly in the youth on whom the future depends. It is a culture which is centered around power as the supreme value and which denounces justice and the equality of men again and again as the disgusting remnants of a decadent democracy.

"The limitation of the [false] democratic principle of tolerance towards others is defined by the [Critical Theory] maxim of 'democratic intolerance toward intolerance.' This right and duty to intolerance is very important if is to live anywhere on this globe.

"Experiments in leadership training have shown that it is even possible under certain circumstances to transform highly autocratic leaders of long standing within a short time into efficient democratic [sic] leaders ... These changes, however, are changes of individuals and small groups in a direction which is in line with some aspects of the general cultural setting in which these individuals or groups live. To change the culture of a whole nation is quite a different undertaking. The greater numbers involved is merely one of the difficulties. Even more important are certain dynamic relations between the various aspects of culture of a nation—such as its education, mores, political behavior, religious outlook—which interact in a way that tends to bend deviation ... back to the old system.

"As someone put it, 'Cultures are pretty watertight.' ... To be stable, a cultural change has to penetrate more or less into all aspects of a nation's life. The change must, in short, be a change in the 'cultural atmosphere', not merely a change of single items.

37. Webster's dictionary: "**autocracy 1:** the authority or rule of an autocrat **2:** government in which one person possesses unlimited power **3:** a community or state governed by an autocrat. **laissez-faire 1:** a doctrine opposing governmental interference **2:** a doctrine opposing governmental interference in economic affairs beyond the minimum necessary for maintenance of peace and

property rights 3: a philosophy or practice characterized by a usually deliberate abstention from direction or interference esp. with individual freedom of choice and action.

38. It should be noted that Karl Lewin, who contributed mightily to the so-called Morgenthau Plan, shared one viewpoint with Georg Lukacs, the nominal founder of the Frankfurt School. Lukacs argued that Bolshevism in Hungary had failed because the Bela Kun had not killed enough of the opposition. In 1943, setting out a plan for the destruction and "re-constitution" of post-war Germany, Lewin would write for the *Public Opinion Quarterly*: "The German move for democracy after [World War I] did not fail because the so-called German Revolution was too chaotic, but because the overthrow of the Kaiser was entirely bloodless and did not reach deep enough ... to remove the idea of democracy from its identification with individual freedom of the laissez-faire type ... To apply the principles of 'individualistic freedom' merely leads to chaos. Sometimes people must be forcefully made to see what democratic responsibility toward the group as a whole means."
39. In conversations in wartime London with Kenneth Crawford, an American correspondent she cultivated, Anna Freud was ironic, and bitter about her father's ruthless attitudes and behavior towards women, particularly his wife.

    Not too long ago, the Washington Post (*mirabile dictu*) ran a piece in its Outlook section, *Was McCarthy Right?* in which it discussed the many cases over which years back the *Washington Post* frothed at the mouth, and arrived at the conclusion that those who had exposed the Communist infiltration of the government—Chambers, Bentley, Massing, Budenz, etc.—had been right, though Joe McCarthy was still in its eyes a boor and a drunk who was correct only by accident. The rest of the media which had followed the *Post*'s lead, remained remarkably quiet over this confession.
41. It is ironic that Columbia, at which John Dewey and the Frankfurt School began it all, is one of the few important universities which moderately retains a traditional curriculum. Elsewhere, once great academic institutions produce graduates who must be taught the ABCs of science and the liberal arts by the industries which absorb them.

42. Cf. *Codes of Silence*, by Alan C. Kors and Harvey A. Silvergate, Reason, November 1998. The Russians say it much better. "When you speak to a general, shut up."
43. Many codes explicitly encourage charging a student with sexual harassment even if his intent is innocent: *University of Puget Sound*: "whether conduct is unwelcome depends on the point of view of the person to whom the conduct is directed. While it is generally better for a person harassed to make it clear that the conduct is unwelcome the conduct may be found unwelcome, even if the person did not manifestly object to it." *Bowdoin* defines harassing speech to include "telling stories of sexual assault which minimize or glorify the act ... leering, staring, catcalls, vulgar jokes, language, photographs or cartoons with sexual overtones ... terms of familiarity." *University of Connecticut*: "Harassment exists, even if the victim's assumptions are patently unreasonable." *Columbia University*: "As a community, we are committed to the principle that individuals are to be treated as members of a category."
44. It should be noted that not only Abbe Hoffman and the student "revolutionaries" were on Marcuse's side. *Eros and Civilization* was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation which joined with corporate America in subsidizing much of the Frankfurt School's activities.

    Marcuse's use of Eros instead of unbridled sexuality is interesting, for it reaches back to theological debate about *love* which posited *agape* or sacred love, against *eros* or lust.
45. Louis Gordon, *Midstream*, November/December 1998. It is interesting to note that during that parlous period, Brandeis could list among its graduates Martin Peretz '59, now publisher of The *New Republic;* the late Stephen Solarz '62, Member of Congress; and Thomas Friedman '75, now of the *New York Times.*
46. In fact, Mark Felt and Ed Miller were indicted and convicted. In 2006, Felt admitted that he had been "Deep Throat", the Watergate leaker. Marcuse's link to the Weather Underground was far more than inspirational. A student leader of the Spring 1968 "revolt" at Columbia University later disclosed that the campus Weatherman group were provided with a steady stream of cash, via a Ford Foundation-funded "community group", the East Side Service Organization, headed by Marcuse's nephew Tom Neumann.

47. As Lazarsfeld would subsequently write, Adorno's "interviews with people in the radio industry led to complaints of biased questions and distorted replies, and he told musicians what idiots they were."
48. In *The Dialectical Imagination,* Martin Jay writes of Adorno: "His first piece written in America, *On the Fetish Character of Music and the Regression of Hearing* appeared in [the Institute's publication] in 1938. Continuing his generally critical evaluation of contemporary music, the article served as a rebuttal to the more optimistic analysis of the social significance of another mode of popular culture, the film. He called for an end to "the fraudulent happiness of affirmative art." Fetishization, however was not only a methodological failing. As Marx had demonstrated, it was even more an element of alienated capitalist culture."
49. *Nazism* was derivatively rooted in Marxism-Leninism with racism partially replacing the class struggle. Though like Hitler Mussolini began as a Socialist, Fascism was not Marxist-Leninist but allegedly based on a Trinitarian system of cooperation between capital, labor, and government, unracist until Hitler twisted Mussolini's arm into imposing the Nuremberg laws.
50. As Judith A. Reisman's carefully documented account, *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences* discloses, he was a sexual aberrant himself. Much of his "findings" were based not on fact, but on his fevered imagination. He compelled his wife and his staff to engage in orgiastic acts, which he filmed and showed. He was an obsessive masturbator, and at one time attempted to rip out his sexual organs. His "experiments" involved criminal sexual acts which would have led to prison had they been discovered at the time.
51. Two points should be made. 1) Under Stalin, the Comintern, the underground party, and the secret police had all worked to introduce and encourage drug use as a means of undermining the will of the West. 2) The Venona intercepts prove conclusively that Franz Neumann of the Frankfurt School was not only of considerable importance in OSS policy making, but was also a disciplined member of a KGB espionage and policy-influence *apparat.*
52. For Marcuse, it was a bonanza. His *One-Dimensional Man,* heavy reading at best, sold 100,000 copies in its first five years and was translated into 16 languages. His *Eros and Civilization* (originally funded by the Rockefeller Foundation), which glorified unre-

strained eroticism also did very well and became *must* reading in many college courses.

53. To be consistent, many environmentalists, Critical Theorists, and their allied Humanists have substituted for Biblical authority the pagan mother-goddess Gaia, which serves a double purpose: animals over man, and female over male.
54. Testimony of Patrick Moore, founding member and former director of Greenpeace: "Much of the environmental movement has been high-jacked by extremist activists who use the language of the environment for a movement that has more to do with class struggle and [anti-industry]."
55. It is interesting that "Wild Bill" Donovan, who was spoon-fed by KGB "mole "Dickie" Ellis, lied to the House Military Affairs Committee when he stated that "I try to determine whether a man is a Fascist or a Communist—I have never taken a man of whom I had any doubt." In fact, OSS officials testified after the war that he had knowingly recruited open Communist Party members and secret agents.

Index

Adams, Henry, 3
Adenauer, Konrad, 132, 212
Adler Alfred, 239
Adler, Luther, 119
Adorno, Theodor, 31, 51 *et seq.*65, 76, 88, 90, 100-1, 119, 128, 149, 153, 156, 164, 172-3, 178, 182, 211, 247
Alexander, Lamar, 111
Allport, Gordon, 138, 172
Alsop, Stewart, 125
Arendt, Hannah, 31, 56
Aron, Raymond, 211
Atkinson, Gerald L., 143-45
Auden, W. H., 63, 71-2, 74, 238

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 52
Back, Kurt, 138
Bakunin, Michael, 34, 39, 45
Bari, Judi, 206
Barrett, Catherine, 240
Basie, Count, 123
Baudelaire, Charles, 61
Beethoven, Ludwig van, 149
Benda, Julian, 13, 27
Benedict, Ruth, 101
Bentley, Elizabeth, 133-4, 243, 245
Berle, AA, 240
Berlin, Isaiah, 238
Bernays, Eric, 170-1
Berlioz, Hector, 149
Bettelheim, Bruno, 181
Beveridge, Lord, 75, 78-9
Bininotto, Robert, 89
Birkenhead, Leon, 172
Blumenfeld, Samuel, 111
Blunt, Anthony, 74
Boas, Franz, ;101
Brandt, Willi, 135
Brecht, Bertold, 32, 40, 63, 65, 66 *et seq.*, 77, 119, 168, 237, 241
Breda, Ludwig, see Katz, Otto
Brower, David, 207
Buehler, Charlotte, 171
Bullitt, William C., 22, 45-6
Burgess, Guy, 45, 73-74
Burke, Edmund, 35
Butler, Nicholas Murray, 80, 84, 101, 239

Carmichael, Stokely, 157
Carson, Rachel, 204
Cervantes, Miguel de, 149
Chambers, Whittaker, 13, 35, 133, 236, 237, 242, 245
Chaplin, Charlie, 69
Chiang Kai-shek, 125
Clay, Lucius, 124, 157

Clark, Mark, 125
Clemenceau, Georges, 16-7
Counts, George S., 16-7
Churchill, Winston, 130
Cole, G.D.H., 211
Coolidge, Calvin, 58
Cooper, Gary ????
Creel, George, 14, 15 *et seq.*
Cremin, Lawrence, 104
Croly, Herbert, 29, 101
Currie, Lauchlin,127, 133-5

Dassin, Jules, 117, 237
Davis, Angela, 158
Davis, John, 207
de Gaulle, Charles, 129
Dewey, John, 9, 48, 80, 81, 84-86, 101-4, 106-7, 111, 113, 123, 138, 148, 188, 239, 245
Dietrich, Marlene, 69, 171
Dillinger, John, 1
Djerzhinski, Felix, 9, 20, 25, 46, 71, 95, 116, 236
Dolivet, Louis, 105
Donovan, William, 124, 127-8, 248
Dostoevsky, Feodor, 23, 26
Douglas, William O., 203
Duarte, Jacqueline, 200
Dubinsky, David, 122
Duggan, Lawrence, 243
Dulles, Allan, 97, 125, 130
Dunne, Irene, 119
Dunphy, John J., 196
Dupont, Pete, 208

Ebert, Friedrich, 56-8
Efron, Edith, 175-6
Ehrenburg, Ilya, 62
Ehrlich, Paul, 204
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 124, 130, 132, 135
Eisler, Gerhard, 31, 87, 120, 142
Eisler, Hanns, 31, 65, 78, 89, 119, 163, 237
Eisler, Hede, see Massing, Hede
Ellis, Charles ("Dickie"), 45, 74, 116, 124, 127-8, 242, 248
Elmhirst, Dorothy, 105
Elsie the Cow, 205
Engels, Friedrich, 11, 43, 45

Fairbank, John K., 121
Felt, Mark, 246
Fernichel, Otto, 60-1
Fenkel, Else, 162
Ferdinand & Isabella, 178
Feuchtwanger, Lion, 67
Field, Marshall, 122
Field, Noel & Herta, 78, 125, 130
Fields, Suzanne, 192
Fischer, Ruth, 13, 25, 28, 236, 241
Fleisch, Rudolf, 109
Fonda, Jane, 119
Ford, Henry II, 84
Forister, Dick, 202
Forster, E.M., 74
Freeman, Bud, 242
Freud, Sigmund, 27, 37-8, 48, 50, 60, 82, 97, 105, 159, 164, 167
Friedan Betty, 107, 140 *et seq.* 149
Friedan, Carl, 142
Fromm, Erich, 31, 34-5, 48, 51, 76, 84, 88, 90, 101, 104, 106, 148, 153, 156, 157, 163 *et seq.*, 179 182

Garfield, John, 119
Gates, John, 125
Geiger, Ken, 112
George, Stefan, 63
Gillingham, Anna, 110
Ginsberg, Allan, 149
Ginsberg, Schmelke, see Krivitsky, Walter
Glaser, Erika, 130

Goebbels, Joseph, 129
Goldmann, Lucien, 159, 201
Goering, Hermann, 57
Goodman, Benny, 123
Gore, Albert, 202-204, 206
Greene, Graham, 74
Gropius, Walter, 63
Gross, Otto, 60, 105, 191-2
Grossman, Henryk, 49
Grosz, George, 63-5, 68
Groves, Leslie, 124, 242
Gruenberg, Carl, 31-2
Gumpertz, Hede, see Massing, Hede
Gumpertz, Julian, 31, 49, 85

Hall, G. Stanley, 106
Hammett, Dashiel, 23, 120, 163
Hammond, John, 123
Hayakawa, S. I., 175-6
Haydn, Joseph, 149
Hayek, Frederick, 79
Haycock, Kati, 193
Hays, John E., 209
Hegel, Georg, 36, 46, 49, 54, 157-8
Heidegger, Martin, 23, 26
Hellman, Lillian, 23, 120, 163
Helms, Richard, 198
Hess, Moses, 34
Herzog, Herts, 172
Hichens, Peter, 213
Hicks, Granville, 132
Himmler, Heimlich, 34
Hindenburg, Paul von, 58-9
Hirschfeld, Magnus, 64
Hiss, Alger, 134, 242, 243
Hitler, Adolf, 9, 17-9, 34, 49, 55-7, 59, 68, 75, 77, 82, 123-4, 129, 132, 134-5, 167, 178, 186, 209, 247
Hobbes, Thomas, 208
Hoffman, Abbie, 151, 158-9, 246
Holahan, Major, 125
Holiday, Billie, 123
Hook, Sidney, 84
Hopkins, Harry, 134
Horkheimer, Max, 6, 31, 43, 46 *et seq.*, 50, 61, 71, 76, 78, 80, 83-4, 101, 120, 153, 156, 163-4, 172, 177-8, 180, 210-2, 237, 239
Horney, Karen, 166
Horowitz, David, 141-2
House, Edward, 56
Hubbard, Alfred, 198
Hull, Cordell, 134, 243
Huxley, Aldous, 93, 95, 101, 154, 197, 199

Ingersoll, Ralph, 122
Isherwood, Christopher, 62, 199

Jackson, Jesse, 151
Jahoda, Marie, 181
Jannings, Emil, 69
Jay, Martin, 50, 76, 80, 90, 159, 181, 184, 222, 247
Johnson, Lyndon, 138, 172, 175, 178, 202
Judis, John, 186-7

Kafka, Franz, 66
Kamenev, Lev, 15
Katz, Barry, 125, 128-9, 131
Katz, Otto, 65-6, 69-70, 76 *et seq.*, 81, 89, 95, 105, 110, 116, 120-1, 142, 157, 163, 171, 238
Kazan, Elia, 120
Kazekevich, Vladimir, 128
Kennedy, John F., 187
Kennedy, Robert F., 144
Kerensky, Alexander, 12, 14, 41, 241
Keynes, John Maynard, 73
Kinsey, Alfred, 182, 186, 247
Kipling, Rudyard, 95

Klehr, Harvey, 209
Koch, Stephen, 72
Korda, Alexander, 24, 43, 69, 119
Korsch, Karl, 43, 53 *et seq.*, 138
Krivitsky, Walter, 87, 122
Kurz, Irwin, 192
Kuusinen, Otto, 45

Lafargue, Paul, 30
Lane, Homoer, 104
Laski, Harold, 63, 75, 79
Latham, Earl, 133
Lattimore, Owen, 121, 244
Lawson, John Howard, 120
Lazarsfeld, 38, 171, 181, 186, 247
Leary, Timothy, 155, 199
Lee, Duncan, 134
Lenin, V. I., 8, 9, 13-6, 18-26, 41, 50-1, 53, 56, 61, 68, 134, 149, 179, 189
Lewin, Kurt, 106-7, 137 *et seq.*, 145, 149, 153, 173-4, 245
Liebnecht, Karl, 43
Lindbergh, Charles, 123
Lippmann, Walter, 29-30, 122, 134, 146, 191
Lloyd George, David, 16-7
Longworth, Alice R., 46
Loos, Anita, 63-4
Lorre, Peter, 69
Lowenthal, Leo, 128, 163, 181, 210, 211
Lowinger, Gyorgy, see Lukacs, Georg
Luce, Henry, 199
Ludendorff, Erich von, 17, 57
Lukacs, Georg, 9, 23 *et seq.*, 26, 28, 30-2, 38, 43, 47, 60, 69, 95, 110, 116, 148, 190-1, 241
Lunacharsky, Anatol, 101, 104, 107
Luxembourg, Rosa, 43
Lvov, Prince, 14, 41

Lynd, Robert, 80, 84-5, 123, 171, 188

MacIver, Robert, 80, 84-5, 123, 188, 211
MacLean, Donald, 45, 74
MacLeish, Archibald, 127
Mahler, Gustav, 65
Malkin, Michelle, 208
Malraux, André, 12
Maly, Theodore, 72
Mann, Thomas, 25, 30, 61, 66, 171
Manuilsky, Dmitri, 45
Mao Tse-tung, 89, 125
Marcuse, Herbert, 39, 48, 62, 76, 80, 88-90, 101, 128, 130-2, 134-8, 148, 151 *et seq.*, 163, 167, 177, 186, 188, 191, 197, 199, 201, 207, 209-10, 213, 237, 246, 247
Marquard, Kathleen, 207
Marshall, George C., 123, 135
Marx, Groucho, 237
Marx, Karl, 8, 10, 12, 19, 22-3, 47, 49, 50, 54, 68, 71, 73, 82, 84, 90, 94, 132, 137, 139, 151, 156-7, 165, 179, 185, 189, 212, 247
Masaryk, Jan, 117, 238
Maslow, A. H., 91
Massing, Hede, 31, 43, 44-6, 182
Massing, Paul, 31, 211
McCarthy, Joseph, 245
McCloy, John J., 157, 187, 210-11
Mead, Margaret, 101, 138, 198
Menjou, Adolf, 119
Merriam, Charles, 173
Meyer, Cord, 199
Meyer, Gerhard, 211
Michaels, Aaron, 92
Milton, John, 193
Modotti, Tina, 78
Moley, Raymond, 239
Molotov, Vyacheslav, 79

Moore, Patrick, 248
Morgenthau, Henry, 127, 245
Mozart, Wolfgang A., 149
Muenzenberg, Willi, 9, 13, 19, 22, 25-8, 30, 43-4, 47, 65-6, 68-9, 71, 87, 95, 105, 110, 116-7, 139, 148, 157, 189
Muggeridge, Malcolm, 243
Murphy, Gardner, 138
Murphy, Raymond, 134, 243
Murray, Henry, 199
Murrow, Edward (Egbert) R., 88
Mussolini, Benito, 12, 247

Nader, Ralph, 40
Nechaev/Bukharin, 12, 39, 92
Neil, A. S., 104-7
Nelson, Steve, 142
Neuman, Franz, 31, 128, 177, 180, 182, 211, 247
Newton, Huey, 92
Noss, Reed F., 206

Odets, Clifford, 119
O'Hara, John, 120
Ollman, Bertell, 92
Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 96, 202
Orlando, Vittorio, 16-7
Orton, Samuel, 110
Orwell, George, 230

Pavlov, Ivan, 50, 148
Pershing, John, J., 14
Petrov, Vladimir, 45
Philby, Kim, 45, 71, 74-5, 119
Pianitsky, Osip, 45
Piccone, Paul, 90
Pierce, Charles, 196
Piscator, Erwin, 49, 65, 67, 77
Pogany, Joseph, 43
Pollock, Friedrich, 43, 47, 78-9, 128, 164
Popper, Karl, 51
Pound, Ezra, 52
Price, Mary, 134, 191, 243

Radek, Karl, 9, 18-20, 25, 53, 95, 116
Raehn, R. V., 100
Rather, Dan, 176
Reich, Charles, 89
Reich, Robert, 187
Reich, William, 48, 64, 90-1, 96 *et seq.*, 105-6, 140, 157, 165, 186, 191, 192, 213, 241
Reinhardt, Max, 67-8, 241
Reismon, Judith A., 247
Remarque, Erich Maria, 45
Reuther, Walter, 127
Revel, Jean-François, 93
Richards, Cory, 200
Robbins, Lionel, 79
Roberts, Paul Craig, 185
Roosevelt, Elliot, 125
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 118, 124-5, 127, 243
Rose, Alex, 122
Rosenwald, Lessing, 122
Rothschild, Lord, 75
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 151
Rubin, Gerry, 40
Russell, Bertrand, 84, 103, 105
Russell, Dora, 105
Ryskind, Morrie, 119

Sacco-Vanzetti, 23
Sade, Marquis de, 61
Sargant, William, 154
Sartre, Jean Paul, 182
Schneidermann, Philip, 56
Schoenberg, Arnold, 65, 237
Seekt, Hans von, 18, 20, 22, 54
Shakespeare, William, 149
Shalla, Donna, 199

Shaw, George Bernard, 75
Sibbison, Jim, 206
Silvermaster, Nathan G., 243
Simon, Julian, 201, 203
Simone, André, see Katz, Otto
Snoopy, Doggy, Dog, 6
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 93
Sorge, Richard, 32, 43, 44-6, 72, 74, 78, 87, 116
Souvarine, Boris, 241
Sowell, William, 99, 194
Spender, Stephen, 62
Sproule, J. Michael, 174
Stalin, Joseph, 12, 19, 22, 46, 87, 95, 107, 116, 126, 128, 134-5, 210, 238, 247
Stanton, Frank, 172, 186
Steckel, William, 105
Steffans, Lincoln, 22
Stephenson, William ("Intrepid"), 124, 172
Stewart, Donald Ogden, 120
Stilwell, Joseph, 125
Stimson, Henry, 243
Stoddard, Lothrop, 90
Stolbrg, Benjamin, 122
Stone, I. F., 124
Strachey, John, 122, 238
Strachey, Lytton, 73
Straight, Beatrice, 105
Straight, Michael, 105
Straight, Willard, 105
Stresseman, Gustave, 58

Thaelman, George, 83
Thyssen, Fritz, 59
Tillich, Paul, 211
Trailling, Lionel, 72
Trotsky, Leon, 15, 41, 78
Trumbo, Dalton, 120
Turgeniev, Ivan, 11-2
Tzara, Tristan, 64

Van Doran, Irita, 121
Verdi, Giuseppe, 149
Verhovensky, Peter, 40
Veidt, Conrad, 63

Washington, George, 4, 6
Watson, Paul, 206
Wayne, John, 119
Webb, Beatrice, 73, 76
Webb, Sydney, 73, 76
Webster, Noah, 191
Weil, Felix, 28, 44
Weil, Herman, 44
Weill, Kurt, 52, 63, 67, 119, 163, 241
Welles, Sumner, 134-5, 243
Wells, H. G., 75, 105
Werfel, Franz, 66, 237, 238, 241
West, Rebecca, 74
Weyl, Nathaniel, 32-3
White, Harry Dexter, 127, 133-4, 243
Whitney, John Hay, 122
Will, George, 6
Wilson, Edmund, 29
Wilson, Teddy, 123
Wilson, Woodrow, 16-7, 146-7
Wirth, Timothy, 206
Wittfogel, Karl & Rose, 31, 43, 48, 80, 121, 211, 241
Wolfe, Milton, 125
Woltman, Frederick, 128
Wrigley, Philip A., 122

Zetkin, Konstantin, 43
Zilbourg, Gregory, 122
Zinoviev, Lev, 15, 54
Zweig, Stefan, 62

Cry Havoc!

The Great American Bring-down and How it Happened

In the last five decades war has been declared on America and its institutions, and we are losing it. Rape and violent crime have soared. Religion and morality have been under unremitting attack. Education, once among the world's finest has been "dumbed down", threatening the country's ability to compete against an increasingly technological world. Marriage and the family, the tie that binds a viable society, are under major assault. Drug addiction, sexual license, and teenage violence have become epidemic.

How did this happen? In ***Cry Havoc***, journalist and social historian Ralph de Toledano documents in chilling detail how a cabal of intellectuals, educrats, and politicians, manipulated by a well-financed, world-wide conspiracy, organized the strategy to undermine the American system—and how this has been accomplished. His sources have been Presidents, government and academic leaders, top-level intelligence operatives, and the wreckers themselves—in a never-told-before and in-depth account.

Cry Havoc is must-reading. The writing is at Ralph de Toledano's best, better than which no one gets. It focuses on the historical and the contemporary, casting a sharp light on the players and the events of our deeply troubled times. The emphasis is on education, ideology, and communications, and the onslaught on American institutions, principles, and way of life is both timely and significant. Toledano has the crack journalist's eye for sidebar information, which enlivens the reading throughout the book.

—William F. Buckley Jr.

Cry Havoc is not only well written but absolutely right. As one of Ralph de Toledano's great admirers, I read this book with great enthusiasm.

—Prof. Herbert London, pres. Hudson Institute

Cry Havoc is magnificently composed and is the product of enormous research. Although I have seen much on the subject, I learned a great deal from the book. Toledano uncovers continuities between the Frankfort School's conspiracy and the rampant cultural terrorism in America.

—Prof. Paul Gottfried

$18.00

Cry Havoc!

Toledano